A LEARNED AND PROFITABLE Treatise of mans Iustification.

Two Bookes.

Opposed to the Sophismes of *Robert Bellarmine*, Iesuite.

By Iohn Piscator, *professor of Diuinitie in the famous Schoole of* Nassouia Sigena.

Imprinted at London by Thomas Creede, for Raphe Iackson, dwelling in Paules Church-yard at the signe of the Swanne. 1599.

1268. f. 3.

BIBLIOTHECA

Imprinted at London by Thomas Creede,
for Ralphe Jackson, dwelling in Paules
Church-yard at the signe of the
Swanne. 1595.

TO THE REVEREND and renowmed men, *Daniel Tossanus*, *Iames Kimedoncius*, and *Dauid Parens*: Doctors of sacred Theology, and professors in the famous Vniuersitie of *Heidelberg*: his high-esteemed brethren, greeting.

WIth how great endeuor & subtilty deuised and writhed Sophismes, Robert Bellarmine *Iesuite, hath studied to cloake and defend the Popish errours: and contrariwise, to extenuate and refute the doctrine of the true teachers of the Gospell about Christian faith: it is knowne to them that haue read with iudgement, his disputations of the articles in controuersie betweene the Papists and the Gospellers, whom he falsly calleth heretickes. Those disputations, whē not long since they came also to my handes, I read them desirously, and was not a little greeued, when I saw the truth of the Gospel to be with such a sterne oppugned. And whē I remembred how I heard of a credible man, that learned men addicted to the Popish religion, so greatly boasted of this*

Bellarmine, as if he were some Goliath of the Papists, that they feared not to say he was inuincible: I began earnestly to desire that God would stirre vp many of the teachers of the Gospel, valiantly & happily to withstand the enterprises of this Goliath, & with the stone of Gods word handsomely throwne out of the sling of true Logicke, to fell him downe, and finally, to kill him with his owne sword. And I gaue God thankes, that euen then he had stirred vp some learned men which had prosperously begun this fight with him: among whom first was knowne vnto me, that famous man William Whitakers, who fought with him manfully and happily about the holy scripture, and purposed also to dispute against him about other chiefe points in controuersie. God the father of our Lord Iesus Christ, graunt that what he hath holily purposed, he may prosperously bring to effect.

But when as about the same time I was to write and propound for publicke disputation in the famous schoole of Nassouia Herborne, positions of Iustification, I thought it would be worth my labour diligently to inquire into Bellarmines sophismes, published concerning that article of faith, and to endeauour briefly & plainly to refute them. And by this occasion was this my writing brought forth, which now I publish abroad. Which when for the length thereof I

 saw

saw not meet to be proposed for Positions publikely to bee disputed of in the schoole: I then wrote and set out other positions of Iustification: and reserued this writing for a more fit time. It fell out about the same time, that the learned man Conradus Vorstius Agrippensis, *treated among you, and of you a while after, Doctor of Theologie, desired by Letters mine opinion about soluing one or two of* Bellarmines *sophismes in the controuersie of Iustification: vnto whom I sent to that end this writing: and withall, requested him to communicate it with learned men, of which your Vniuersitie hath store, and to knowe their iudgements of it, and write me word. He therefore of late about* Francfurt *Mart, passing by* Sigena, *and for the friendship betweene vs, saluting me, told me how he had giuen you this writing of mine to reade, and that you hauing read it, affirmed vnto him that you liked all therein, and would exhort me to set it forth, distinguished into two Bookes and certain Chapters: which thing (if the whole of it be not long after from* Heidelberg, *and so stirred me vp a fresh to finish this writing. Now therfore commeth this my writing forth in the name of the Lord: and it commeth forth vnder your excellent name: for that I thought I should doo conueniently, to offer this doctrine to be defended by them (together with my selfe) which had*

once

once appointed it for a good and right opinion? and therewithal publikely to testifie our holy consent in this heauenly truth. You therefore reuerend brethren, take this my doing in good part: and valiantly defend as oft as need shal require, together with me, the wrieth of Christian doctrine deliuered in this writing: to the glorie of Gods name, and profit of Christs Church. To conclude, I commend you and your holy labours to God, the Father of our Lord Iesus Christ.

At Sigena, from the famous Schools of Nassouia, the 18. of December, 1594.

Your Brother,

Iohn Pistorius, of Argentine.

OF MANS IVSTIFICATION before God.

The first booke.

VVherein the iudgement of the *professors of the Gospell is recited*, confirmed and defended *from* Bellarmines exceptions.

CHAP. I.

Of the diuers significations of the word Iustifying.

WHen it is demaunded, how a man may be iustifyed before God: the word *Iustifie* is taken two wayes: sometime for to make or to be made iust: and sometime for to pronounce, or to be pronounced iust.

These two do consent and agree betweene themselues, as the cause efficient, and the effect. For God, being a iust iudge, pronounceth no man iust, neither accounteth any, but him whome he hath first made iust.

And God maketh a man iust (whome he will pronounce iust) by imputation of iustice: that is, for so much as he imputeth iustice to him, or (that which is all one) imputeth not sinnes vnto him, but pardoneth & forgiueth them, *Rom.4.ver.5.6.7.8.*

In the first signification, the word [*Iustifying*] is taken *Rom.4.5.* where the Apostle sayth, *To him that worketh not, but beleeueth in him that iustifieth the vngodly, his faith is imputed for iustice.* Heere God is sayd to iustifie the vngodly. But God pronounceth not the vngodly iust, but maketh him iust; and that whiles he imputeth iustice vnto him: as the Apostle teacheth in this place. And then at last pronounceth him iust. And so the Apostle himselfe expoundeth the word *Iustified*, by *to be made iust. Rom.5.19.*

In the latter signification it is taken *Rom.8.33.* where the Apostle sayth: *Who shall accuse Gods elect? God is he that iustifieth. Who is hee that condemneth?* Heere,

vnto

vnto iustification is manifestly opposed condemnation: whereby we may perceiue that by that word here is signified iudicial acquitting, whereby the iudge pronounceth iust and innocent the guiltie partie, (that is, him that is accused and brought to the iudgement seate.)

But, Iustification being taken this latter way, is againe to be distinguished. For it is done either in this life, and that in iustifying euery one apart by himselfe and secretly: or after this life, in that vniuersall day of iudgement, in al together and openly.

For God hath set vp his iudgement seat in the conscience of man, in as much as he hath so indued mās mind with knowledge of iust and vniust, that if he haue done any vniust thing, his conscience of it owne accord, as it were summoneth him to Gods iudgement seat, and accuseth him: and if he be by others accused vniustly, his cōscience excuseth him. *Rom.* 2. 15. 1. *Ioh.* 3. 20. 21.

In this life therefore God iustifieth or pronounceth man iust, so far forth as he giueth testimony to his soule (by the holy Ghost, the word of grace being the means) of imputed iustice, or of forgiuenes of sins, and by consequence, of adoption, for the satisfaction sake of the mediator, *Rom.* 8. 16.

And in that day of iudgement, Christ being appointed of the father iudge of all, will with his mouth openly before all Angels and men, pronounce iust, and crowne with life eternall the reward of iustice, all those that before were iustified in this life, both by imputation of iustice, and by that secret testimonie of the holy Ghost. But the rest he will condemne as transgressors of the law, and punish them with eternall paine: *Rom.* 11.12.13.14.15.16. *Mat* 25. 31. *&c.*

CHAP. II.

The state of the controuersie, and partition of this disputation.

FVrthermore, about mans Iustification before God, being taken the first way, this question chiefly is controuerted betwixt the professors of the Gospell, and the Papists, especially the Iesuites: whether Iustification be infusing of iustice, or whether it be imputing of iustice? For the Papists say, that iustification is infusing of iustice: but the Gospellers say, that it is imputing of iustice.

We in the first place will declare and confirme the Gospellers opinion as true, and

and therefore first by nature: then will we recite and refute the opinion of the Papists.

CHAP. III.

The Gospellers opinion expounded by seuen parts.

WHen the Gospellers therefore say, that iustification is imputing of iustice, their meaning is, 1. that man by himself and his own nature vniust, is accounted for iust: 2. and thereupō pronounced iust of God: 3. in as much as he forgiueth him his sinnes for the satisfaction of Christ, performed for him: 4. and apprehēded of him by faith: 5. and therfore that mā is iustified by faith only: because he is counted iust, and by consequence pronounced iust, for Christes satisfaction only which is imputed to him by faith only: for that he doth not apprehend and apply it to himselfe, but by faith: 6. and so that man is iustified, partly by Gods grace or free loue, with which he being moued, did ordayne Christ to be satisfier or mediator for the elect: 7. partly by Gods iustice, whereby accepting Christs satisfaction for the elect, he imputeth the same vnto them: and

thereupon receiueth them into fauour, and adopteth them for sonnes and heyres of eternall life.

The Gospellers opinion being thus declared, it followeth next that we confirme by testimonies of scripture all the parts thereof, and free it from the obiections of the Papists.

CHAP. IIII.

The first part of the opinion expounded is confirmed, and the same confirmation freed from Bellarmines *exception.*

AND first, that man by himselfe and of his owne nature being vniust, is counted for iust, *Paul* beareth witnesse *Rom.4.5.6.* in these words, *To him that worketh not, but beleeueth in him that iustifieth the vngodly, his faith is imputed for iustice: as also* Dauid *declareth the blessednesse of that man to whome God imputeth iustice.* The like sentences are in the same chapter, *verse.9.10.22.23.24.*

2. *Booke of iustification Chap.9.* Against this proofe *Bellarmine* exceipteth: that the word *Impute* in this place „ doth not signifie a bare accounting: but „ an accounting whereunto the truth in the thing

thing it ſelfe maketh anſwere, as is plaine » by theſe words, *To him that worketh, wages* » *is imputed, not according to grace, but ac-* » *cording to debt.* For it is certaine, that to him » that worketh, wages is due, not only in o- » pinion and accounting, but in truth and » in deede. »

I anſwere. Here *Bellarmine* firſt of all cõmitteth the fault of falſhood, in as much as he inuerteth the order of the Apoſtles words, that they may ſerue his purpoſe. For it is not in that place, *To him that worketh, wages is imputed, not according to grace, &c.* But it is, *To him that worketh, wages is not imputed according to grace, &c.* Neyther may *Bellarmine* except, that it skilleth not, whither way the aduerbe of denyall be there placed: becauſe, howſoeuer it be there placed, yet in the oppoſition, the word *Imputed*, is to be repeated thus: But (the wages) *is imputed according to debt.* For by the very phraſe wee may perceiue, that after the words [*ou logizetai*] *is not imputed*, theſe words muſt bee vnderſtoode [*tout'eſtin ou didotai*] *that is, is not giuen*: and therefore that in the oppoſition, the word [*didotai*] *giuen*, is to be vnderſtoode, that the whole ſentence is this: [*tó ergazomeno*

ho misthos en logizetai, toutestin ou di-
dotai cata charin, alla dikaiotai cata to opheil-
lema:] that is; *To him that worketh, wa-*
ges is not imputed, that is to say, is not given
according to grace: but is given according to
debt. And if *Bellarmine* will not graunt
this * *ellipsis*, he must confesse that here is a
manifest ‡ *pleonasmus* in the former part,
and also a manifest ◦ *catachresis* in the latter
part. For if one say, *Wages is not imputed*:
is not this as if he should say, *Wages is not*
given according to grace? It is therefore
a *pleonasmus* if one say, *It is not imputed*
according to grace. Also if any say, *Wa-*
ges is not imputed, but is given according
to debt: he speaketh properly. Therefore
if one say, *Wages is imputed according to*
debt: he (as touching the word *imputed*)
speaketh improperly. Wherefore this
place is not of force to shift off the other in
which it is plaine by the Apostles words,
that the proper signification of the word
Imputed is kept. For he sayth, that *Faith is*
imputed for iustice to him that worketh not,
but believeth in him that iustifieth the un-
godly. Which what other thing is it, then
that man is iustified, not by debt or desert
of his works, but by grace for Christs sa-
tisfaction apprehended by faith? It is
there-

* i. want of a word.
‡ i. abounding of a word.
◦ i. abuse of a word.

therefore nothing to the matter that *Bellarmine* sayth: that wages is so imputed, that in the meane time it is due indeed. As though it were in the same respect said, that faith is imputed for *Iustice*. But euen *Bellarmine* himselfe also teacheth, that faith is giuen to man of grace, and likewise, that iustification of which we speake in this place: which he is wont to name the first. Whereupon doubtlesse it followeth, that neither faith nor this iustification is owed to a man; seeing debt and grace are heere manifestly set one against an other.

And whereas *Bellarmine* saith, that by the word *Imputing* is signified that accounting whereunto the truth in the thing it selfe maketh answere: it is truly said, if it be rightly vnderstood. For to whom God imputeth iustice, they are truly iust; but by imputed iustice, and not inherent; as *Bellarmine* vnderstandeth. Euen as he whose debts his suretie hath paid to the creditor, oweth the creditor indeede nothing, though himselfe paide not his debts, neither had wherewith to pay them.

CHAP. V.

The confirmation and freeing of the second part.

SEcondly, that man of himselfe and his owne nature vniust, but now being endued with imputed iustice, is pronounced Iust of God: the truth of this sentence is plaine by these testimonies, in which condemnation is opposed to iustification: as *Rom.* 5. 16. *Iudgement verily of one vnto condemnation: but grace of many offences vnto iustification.* And *ver.* 8. *As by the fall of one, sinne entred vpon all men vnto condemnation: so also by the iust-worke* (dicaioma) *of one, iustice entred vpon all men vnto iustification of life.* And Chap. 8. 33. 34. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that iustifieth, who is he that condemneth?*

Against this proofe *Bellarmine* excepteth: that the word *Iustification* doth not alwaies pertain to the iudgemēt place, because it is opposed to condemnation. For condemnation is sometime an effect of the fault which deserueth punishmēt. And as *Adam* cōdemned vs, not by iudging, nor after the maner vsed in iudgement places, but

but by imprinting originall blame, but " God hath condēned by iudging: ſo Chriſt " as the ſecond *Adam*, iuſtifieth vs by put- " ting out our ſinnes, and infuſing grace: and " ſecondly ſhal iuſtifie vs in the day of iudg- " ment, by declaring them iuſt whom he be- " fore hath made iuſt. I anſwer. Firſt this ex- " ceptiō maketh nothing againſt the proofe brought from *Rom.*8. For although the word *condemning* be not alwaies belonging to the iudgement place; yet that it is ſo there, is manifeſt by that which the Apoſtle ſaith, *Who ſhall accuſe Gods elect?* Moreouer this exception corrupteth the place of the 5. Chapter, both touching the words, & touching the ſenſe. For the Apoſtle ſaith not there, either that *Adam* condemned vs, or Chriſt iuſtifieth vs: but ſaith, by one offēce of *Adam*, iudgemēt, that is, guiltineſſe came vpon all men vnto cōdemnation: likewiſe by the iuſt-work (*dicaioma*) that is, ſatiſfactiō of Chriſt, the gift, that is, iuſtice came vpon all men, vnto iuſtification of life. Where both condēnation & iuſtification are referred vnto god as Iudge: who may with right cōdemne all *Adams* naturall childrē, for the ſin that he cōmitted; & who iuſtifieth them to whom he hath giuen iuſtice, for the ſatisfaction ſake of Chriſt.

Furthermore

Furthermore, *Bellarmines* reasoning from a contrary sense, or from a like reason of contraries, stayeth vpon a false supposition: to wit, a false opposition of contraries. For these are not opposite one to an other, *to imprint originall blame*, and *to put out sins*, (to wit, from nature) *and infuse grace*, that is, inherent iustice. But these are opposite, *to imprint originall blame*, and, *to put out originall blame*; likewise, *to obtaine imputation of iustice*. And indeed as *Adam* imprinted by his fall original blame in all his children, so Christ for those that pertaine vnto him, hath put out that blame, and obtained imputation of iustice by his satisfaction.

Moreouer, although as *Adam* did not onely imprint blame in his posteritie, but also by generation infused into them the very force of sinne: so Christ also, hath not onely put out the blame of the elect, and obtained imputation of iustice for them, but also regenerateth them by his holy spirit, and by that regeneratiō, putteth out the force of sinne, and infuseth iustice or studie of good workes: yet in that place of the Apostle, he speaketh not of this benefite of Christ, but onely of the other. And of the benefit of regeneration or sanctification, he entreateth afterwards in the 6. 7. & 8. Chap-

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The confirmation and clearing of the third part.

THirdly, that man is accounted for iust, and pronounced iust of God, inas much as God forgiueth him his sins for the satisfaction of Christ, and therefore that iustification is no other thing then forgiuenesse of sinnes: these sayings teach vs. *Rom.* 4. 6. 7. 8. *Dauid* saith, *That blessed is that man, to whom God imputeth iustice without works*: saying, *Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiuen, and whose sinnes are couered: blessed is the man to whom the Lord shall not impute sinne.* In these words it is certaine, that the full definition of Iustification is contained: for of this the Apostle manifestly there entreateth: to wit, minding to teach how man is iustified before God, as appeareth by comparing together those things which go before, from the 17. verse of the 1. Chapter, vnto this place. And he defineth Iustification here, by imputation of iustice, or (that which he taketh for the same) forgiuenesse of sinnes.

Against this proofe, *Bellarmine* excepteth

2. Booke of iustification. Chap. 9.

cepteth: that *Paul* alleageth not this testimonie of the Psalme, perfectly to define Iustification: but onely to proue, that true Iustification is the gift of God, and cannot
„ be gotten by our owne strength. He also
„ saith, it may be answered, that in these
„ words a perfect definition is contained, but
„ intricately. For, forgiuenesse of sinnes,
„ saith he, cannot be except iustice be infu-
„ sed: euen as darknesse is not driuen away,
„ except light come in place therof. Also: by
„ not imputing of sins, saith he, the Apostle
„ gathereth imputing of iustice: and by this
„ teacheth, that these two cannot be separa-
„ ted, forgiuenesse of sinnes and giuing of iu-
„ stice, to wit, inherent; for this *Bellarmine* vnderstandeth.

I aunswere, that *Paul* alleageth the testimonie of this Psalme perfectly to define Iustification, is plaine by his drift, and comparing togither things that went before: as euen now we warned. Wherefore *Bellarmine* feigneth here a false drift. Whereupon it followeth, that it is also false, that heere is contained a perfect definition intricately; to wit, infusion of inherent iustice beeing vnderstoode herewithall, as the other, and that the principall part of iustification.

And

And although it be true, that with iuſtifying faith, inherent iuſtice is togither infuſed, not perfect, but begunne: yet is it not true, neither followeth it, that this iuſtice is a part of that iuſtice whereby wee ſtand before the iudgement ſeate of GOD, about which the Apoſtle dealeth in this place. Beſides, *Bellarmine* maketh a falſe compariſon. For infuſion of iuſtice is not ſo in reſpect of forgiuenesſe of ſinnes, as infuſion of light into the ayre, to driue darkeneſſe out of the ſame: but is ſo compared vnto the reall putting out of inhabiting ſinne, which the ſcripture calleth mortification of the fleſh and of the olde man. For how much as inherent iuſtice is infuſed, that is, how much as the ſpirit or new man is quickned: ſo much is inhabiting ſinne put out, or the fleſh and olde man mortified. Moreouer, *Bellarmine* falſly interpreteth the Apoſtles reaſoning; as though he gathered imputatiō of iuſtice, by not imputing of ſinnes, as if it were ſome diuerſe thing. For the Apoſtle doth not gather here a diuerſe thing frō a diuerſe: but proueth imputation of iuſtice by the teſtimonie of *Dauid*: whereby appeareth, that hee holdeth *imputation of Iuſtice* (which he

he would proue) and *not imputing of sinnes* (which is mentioned in the testimonie alleadged) for one and the same thing. For otherwise he should not proue his purpose. For it were ready to except: Thou art in hand to proue imputation of iustice: but *David* mentioneth not imputation of iustice, but not imputing of sinnes: but these are diuers. Wherefore by that testimonie, thou hast yet proued nothing. Thus I say, might one except against the Apostles proofe. Lastly, *Bellarmine* falsly expoundeth imputation of iustice, by giuing of iustice, in as much as he vnderstandeth inherent iustice: seeing these be diuers: neither is there any speech of inherent iustice in this place: and finally seeing it implieth a contradiction, for inherent iustice to be imputed.

2. *Proofe.* But let vs bring now more testimonies to confirme the sentence proposed: viz. that man is iustified, in as much as his sinnes are forgiuen him, for the satisfaction of Christ. *Rom.* 3. 25. *Whom* (to wit Christ) *God hath sette forth to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood, &c. that he may be iust, and iustifying him that is of the faith of Iesus.* And Chapter 4. 24. 25. *It shall be imputed vnto vs* (to wit, faith for iustice) *which*

on

which beleeue in him that raised vp Iesus our Lord from the dead, who was deliuered to death for our sinnes, and raised vp for our iustification. And Chapter, 5.9. *Iustified by his blood.* And Chap. 10. 6. 7. *The iustice which is of faith,* saith thus: *Say not in thy heart; who shall goe vp to heauen? this is to bring Christ from on high:* or, *who shall goe downe into the deepe? this is to bring Christ againe from the dead.* Gal. 2. 20. 21. *I liue by faith of the sonne of God, who loued mee, and gaue himselfe for me: I doe not abrogate the grace of God: for if iustice be by the law, then Christ died in vaine.* Ephe. 1. 6. 7. *God by his grace hath made vs gracious in that beloued one, in whome we haue redemption by his blood, euen forgiuenesse of sinnes.*

Against these proofes some may except, that in these speeches mention is made indeed of Christs satisfaction, as of the first mouing and deseruing cause, for which man is iustified, and his sins forgiuen him: but hence it followeth not, that Iustification consisteth only in forgiuenes of sins: because that Christ by his satisfaction, hath deserued and obtained of God for vs, not onely forgiuenesse of sinnes, but also the gift of the holy Ghost, which doth regenerate vs, and infuse iustice into vs.

I answere. That which is heere saide of Christs merits, is indeed true: but yet in those speeches, is no speech of regeneration, but onely of forgiuenesse of sins as the effect of Christs satisfaction, and as the thing by which we are formally iustified: as chiefly appeareth by that place, *Eph.* 1. 6. 7. Wherfore we must determin, that it is one and the same thing with the Apostle, for *A man to be iustified by the blood of Christ*; and *A man to haue his sinnes forgiuen for the blood of Christ.*

3. *Probe.* Let vs adde also an other place. *Act.* 13. 38. 39. *By this man* (to wit Christ) *is preached to you forgiuenesse of sinnes: and from all things from which ye could not be iustified by Moses law: by this man euery one that beleeueth is iustified.* Heere *Iustification* is manifestly defined, by forgiuenesse of sinnes.

2. *Booke of iustification. Chap.* 12. „ *Bellarmine* excepteth: He that beleeueth, to wit, as he ought: that is, by fulfilling all things which faith sheweth should be fulfilled. For he that beleeueth a Phisitian, though a most skilfull one, and that infallibly cureth, is not healed, except he receiue the medicines that hee appoynteth.

I answere.

I answere. This is a Iesuitish glosse, confounding things diuerse, that I say not aduerse: to wit, *to beleeue in Christ*; and, *to fulfill the law*; or doubtlesse knitting a false consequence, as though the fulfilling of the lawe because it is ioyned with true faith, concurreth as a cause with the same to iustification. Moreouer, hee deceiueth by the diuerse signification of the word *beleeue*: as though *to beleeue in Christ*, were no other thing, then *to beleeue Christ, that he is a most faithfull Phisitian of soules, and curing infallibly, and in the meane time not to receiue the medicines that hee appointeth.*

But I say, that to beleeue in Christ, is by faith to receiue and apply to ones selfe the medicines that Christ appointeth, namely his bloud shead for vs on the Crosse, with feeling of the wrath of God.

Bellarmine addeth: though the Apostle in this place nameth onely the forgiuenesse of sins, yet is it no let, but iustification may be vnderstood to consist in forgiuenesse of sins, & infusion of iustice. For, forgiuenesse of sins is not only forgiuing of the punishmēt, but is the washing away & cleansing of the fault: which washing

thing and cleansing is not, except there succeed the brightnesse of grace & comelinesse of iustice.

I answere. That the Apostle in this place defineth Iustification by forgiuenesse of sins onely, is manifest, partly by the cõsequence of sentences, wherof one is added to an other, as explaining the same: partly by the very phrase, *to be iustified frõ sins*: which is no other thing, then *to be absolued from sins committed*, & by consequence, *to obtaine forgiuenesse of sinnes*. Moreouer, it is vnfitly distinguished by *Bellarmine*, as things diuerse and separable one from an other, *Forgiuenesse of the punishment*, and, *cleansing of the fault*: when as cleansing or rather forgiuing of the fault, is no other thing then deliuerance from the punishment: for hee is said to forgiue the fault, that will not inflict deserued punishment for the fault. Besides, hee confoundeth *cleansing of the fault, with cleansing of inhabiting sinne*, which is by regeneration; seeing vnto the cleansing of the fault, he opposeth the brightnesse of grace and comelinesse or seemelinesse of iustice, to wit, inherent.

Finally, he bideth a false consequence, in that he saith; *The cleansing of the fault is*

not, except there ſucceed the brightneſſe of grace and comelineſſe of iuſtice. By which words hee inſinuateth, if iuſtification conſiſt in forgiuenelle of ſinnes: and this is the cleanſing of the fault: and this cleanſing is not, except there ſucceede inherent iuſtice: it followeth, that inherent iuſtice alſo is part of that iuſtice wherwith man is formally iuſtified. But it is not neceſſarie, that inherent iuſtice ſhould be part of that iuſtice wherewith man is iuſtified, although that iuſtice wherewith man is iuſtified, befall no man (that is growen to yeares of diſcretion) without the gift of inherent iuſtice.

But *Bellarmine* further excepteth, Although, ſaith he, in this place mention onely ſhould be made of iuſtifying from ſinne: yet in many other places, mention is made of ſanctification, cleanſing, waſhing, renewing and the like, which ſhew the other part of Iuſtification.

I anſwere. It ſeemeth, *Bellarmine* by the very phraſe of this place, *to be iuſtified from things*, vnderſtood, that ſpeech heere properly was of iuſtification from ſinnes: that is, of forgiueneſſe of ſinnes: but leaſt he ſhould hurt his cauſe, he will not freely confeſſe this.

Then, in that hee saith, mention is made in other places of sanctification or renewing, it maketh nothing to the matter. For there is indeed mention made thereof euery where: but not as part of iustification, as heere *Bellarmine* by begging the question doth affirme.

Yet *Bellarmine* proceedeth in his exception. That, *from which ye could not be iustified in the law of Moses*, signifieth, saith he, that the obseruation of the law, presumed on by our owne strength, or by the help of the law only doth not iustifie: not that the true obseruation of the law is not iustice; but that the law cannot bee kept, before forgiuenesse of sinnes. For "when God by Christs merits reconcileth "any, he together, both forgiueth him his "sinnes, and infuseth charitie, by which he "keepeth the commandements of the law.

I answere. Whatsoeuer that signifieth, *To be iustified in the law of Moses*: the Apostle saith clearely, that the Iewes to whom he speaketh, could not be iustified in *Moses* law: which thing also *Peter* affirmeth of the fathers, *Act.* 15. where he saith, *that the law was a yoake, that neither they nor their fathers could beare*. And who skilfull in the holy storie, knoweth not,

not, that there were among the fathers some godly, and therefore endued with forgiuenesse of sinnes and the gift of regeneration? And yet they, as *Peter* witnesseth, could not beare the yoake of the law, that is, by keeping of the law, be iustified from their sinnes. Also who dare affirme, that none of those Iewes whom *Paul* then spake vnto, was endued with true faith in Christ to come, although as yet they knew not who he was: and therfore were also endued with the gift of generation? Surely that some of them were such, may be gathered from the 43. verse, where it is said, that many of those Iewes and religious proselytes followed *Paul* and *Barnabas*: and that they perswaded them to continue in the grace of God. And yet these, as *Paul* witnesseth, could not in the law, that is, by the law be iustified. Wherefore that which *Bellarmine* saith, that the true keeping of the lawe is iustice, is true: but it is not true which hee vnderstandeth and insinuateth in the wordes following, namely, that they which haue receiued of GOD, forgiuenesse of sinnes, and the gift of charitie, can performe the true, (that is, perfect) obseruation

of the lawe; so that by that iustice of the law, they can stand in the iudgement of God.

4. Proofe. An other place for a sentence there is, *Luk.* 18. where the Publican is said to bee iustified, when onely hee had asked forgiuenesse of sinnes, saying, *O God bee mercifull vnto mee a sinner.* Contrariwise, the *Pharisee* preaching the gifts of God bestowed on him, and giuing thankes, went away not iustified. Therefore Iustification consisteth not in gifts and good workes, though done through Gods helpe, but onely in forgiuenesse of sinnes.

In the place before cited. Against this proofe *Bellarmine* excepteth thus: when the Publican said, O God bee mercifull to mee a sinner, hee asked not onely forgiuenesse of the debt, as though hee would bee vnrighteous, yet not so accounted of GOD, nor punished: but hee asked whole reconciliation; and the same hee obtained. Whereupon our Lorde concludeth the parable: This man went away iustified from him, for euery one that humbleth himselfe, shall be exalted: and hee that exalteth himselfe, shall be humbled.

The

The exaltation of the humble and penitent publican, ſignifieth doubtleſſe ſomewhat more then onely forgiuenes of his offence. For they are not ſaid to be exalted, whoſe debts are forgiuen: but which are aduanced vnto degrees and honours. Therefore the publican is for this ſaid to be exalted, becauſe of a ſinner he was ſodainly made iuſt, of the ſeruant of ſinne, the ſeruant of iuſtice, of the child of the diuell, the child of God. Moreouer, the Phariſee, deſerued to be ſet after the Publican, not becauſe he rehearſed the gifts of God, and gaue the Lord thanks: but becauſe he was full of the ſwelling of pride, and truſted in his owne iuſtice, ſo as that he would not craue any thing to be added to him, nothing to be forgiuen him: beſides alſo hee contemned the humble Publican.

I anſwere. *Bellarmine* doth heere croockedly cauill at the ſentence of the profeſſors of the Goſpell, as if they did teach that ſuch ſhal receiue forgiuenelle of ſins, as will yet be vnrighteous: or as if ſuch a purpoſe can ſtand with earneſt ſuite for remiſſion of ſinnes. And where he ſaith, that the Publican when he ſaid, *God be merciful vnto me a ſinner*, asked not onely

forgiuenesse of his debt: what is this but to wrest cleare words from their simple sense? Also, what meaneth this, that *Bellarmine* opposeth whole reconciliation vnto forgiuenesse of debt? As though that forgiuing of debt, or remission of sinnes, were not a whole, but onely a halfe reconciliation, against the manifest testimonies of Scripture: Rom. 5. 9. 10. *Being iustified by his blood, we shall be saued now much more by him from wrath; for if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his sonne: much more being reconciled, we shall be saued by his life.* Heere it is manifest, that *to be reconciled vnto God*, is the same that *to be iustified of God*, as may be perceiued by Chap. 4. ver. 5. 6. 7. Yet there is a clearer place, 2. Cor. 5. 19. *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himselfe, not imputing to them their sinnes.* Behold whether the Apostle doth not expresly define reconciliation wherewith we are reconciled vnto God, by forgiuenesse of sinnes? And whereas *Bellarmine* interpreteth that clause, *Euery one that humbleth himselfe, &c.* so as if the Lord would define what it is to be iustified: hee misseth the marke: for

the

the Lord had no other purpose, then by that prouerbiall sentence, to confirme that speciall two-folde example, the one of a man iustified, the other of a man not obtaining Iustification. Likewise, where he interpreteth *to be exalted*, of infusion of iustice, he vseth a fallacie of the consequent, reasoning from the generall to the speciall, affirmatiuely, thus; *To be iustified is to be exalted: therefore it is to bee exalted by infusion of inherent iustice.* But though it be true, that hee which is iustified, is exalted not onely by adoption, but also by regeneration: yet hence it followeth not, that *Iustification* is the same that regeneration. Moreouer *Bellarmine* in this place contradicteth himselfe, whiles now he granteth, that forgiuenesse of sinne is signified by exaltation, and straight way denieth that they are sayd to be exalted whose debts are forgiuen.

Lastly, as touching the Pharisee: it is true, that for spirituall pride and trust in his owne iustice, he was repulsed from God: but in the meane time, this also is true, that the Lord would teach by this example, that this pride is an vnseparable companion of that desire whereby men

men seeke iustice in their owne workes. Neither is *Zacheus*. *Luk.* 19. (which example *Bellarmine* obiecteth) sayd to be iustified by good workes: although when he promised good works, the Lord sayd vnto him, *To day is saluation come to this house*: but only the sincerities of his faith is after this manner commended by the effects. And the cause of *Zacheus* saluation, is shewed in the words immediatly following; for he sayth, *To day is saluation come to this house, for that he also is the sonne of* Abraham: to wit, insisting in the steps of *Abrahams* faith, as *Paul* interpreteth this sonne-ship, *Rom.* 4. 12. For as touching the flesh, many were *Abrahams* sonnes, to whome notwithstanding saluation came not. And king *Ezechias*, (which example *Bellarmine* addeth) although he shewed his good works with a sincere hart: yet he thought not, that he was by them iust before the iudgement seate of God: like as *Paule* sayd, *I know nothing by my selfe; but I am not hereby iustified.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The confirmation of the fourth part.

FOurthly, that man is iustified by faith, in as much as by faith he layeth hold on, and applieth to himselfe Christes satisfaction, may be perceiued by these sayings, *Rom.* 3.24.25. *They are iustified by the redemption made in Christ, whome God hath set forth to be a reconciliation through faith in his bloud.* And chap. 4. 24.25. *It shal be imputed to vs* (to wit, faith for iustice) *which beleeue in him that raised vp our Lord Iesus from the dead: which was deliuered to death for our faults, and raised vp for our iustification.* And chap. 10.6.7. *The iustice which is of faith, saith thus. Say not in thy hart, who shall go vp into heauen? this is to bring Christ from aboue. Or, who shall go downe into the deepe? this is to bring Christ againe from the dead.* *Gal.* 2. 20. *I liue by faith of the sonne of God, who loued me, and gaue himselfe for me, &c.* *Rom.* 4. 5. *To him that worketh not, but beleeueth in him that iustifieth the vngodly, his faith is imputed for iustice.* Where it is manifest, that by the name faith, by a *metonymie*

of

of the adioynt, is to be vnderstood any thing which is by faith imputed to a man for iustice. For to speake properly, that which is in a man, is not said to be imputed to him, but that which is without a man. And faith is in a man, but Christs satisfaction which faith apprehendeth is without a man: whereby it cometh to passe, that it is imputed vnto man by faith: that is to say, is accounted his, so as man is esteemed in this place, as if he had performed the satisfaction for himselfe.

CHAP. VIII.

The confirmation and clearing of the first part.

FIrstly, that man is iustified by faith only, that is, for the onely satisfaction of Christ apprehended by faith: and not partly by faith, that is, for Christs satisfaction imputed; and partly by works, that is, for inherent iustice: may be gathered by the sayings following, which teach that a man is iustified without workes. *Rom. 3. 27. Where is then the reioycing? It is excluded. By what law? of workes? no; but by the law of faith.* And by and by,

verse,

verse, 28. *We conclude therfore, that a man is iustified by faith without the workes of the law.* And Chap. 4. 2. *If Abraham our father were iustified by workes, he hath wherein to reioyce, but not with God.* Gal. 2. 16. *Knowing that man is not iustified by the workes of the law, but by the faith of Iesus Christ: we also haue beleeued in Iesus Christ, that wee might bee iustified by the faith of Christ, and not by the workes of the law.* Eph. 2. 8. 9. *By grace ye are saued through faith, not of workes.* Tit. 3. 5. *Not of iust workes which we had done, but of his owne mercie he saued vs, &c.* Phil. 3. 9. *That I may be found in him, not hauing my own iustice which is of the lawe, but that which is by faith of Christ.*

Vnto those sayings wherein workes are opposed to faith, *Bellarmine* exceepteth first in generall or in commune, that by works which are opposed to faith, & excluded from Iustification, are vnderstood works which go before faith, & which are done by the only strength of free-will, & not all absolutely. And this he saith may be proued frō *Rom.* 4. where we read, saith he, to him that worketh, wages is imputed as by debt, not as by grace. In which place the Apostle openeth himselfe, saith he, what should be vnderstood by workes which

1. *Booke of Iustification. Chap. 19.*

» which are opposed to faith: and faith,
» that he calleth them works, to which that
» which is giuen is wages, not grace. And
» such be not any, but those that are done
» by the onely strength of freewill. For that
» which is giuen to the works that be done
» of grace, such as is the very act of faith,
» and those that follow thereupon, is not
» simply wages, but also grace: yea more
» grace then wages. Thus saith *Bellarmine*.

I answere. It is false, that *Paule* should here say, he calleth them works, to which that which is giuen is wages, not grace: that is, which are done by the onely strength of freewill. For, that he speaketh of works in generall, whether they be done by the strength of freewill or by grace, appeareth by this, that he intreateth there of *Abrahams* workes, those which he had done of grace and faith, as that he was obedient to Gods commandement, and trusting vpon his promise, left his countrie of *Chaldea*, and went into a land which God was to shew him: also, that he refused not to offer his onely sonne *Isaak* at Gods commandement: for these are those workes wherein he might reioyce and boast with men. And from these works doth *Paule* derogate iustifi-

Iustification before God; by this argument which is taken from the generall; for that to him that worketh, wages is giuen as by debt, and is not imputed, that is, not giuen of grace: but to *Abraham* iustice was imputed. And whereas *Bellarmine* saith: that which is giuen to workes which be done of grace, is partly wages, partly grace: therein hee feigneth, that things immediately aduerse, may stand togither; and that against the Apostles manifest sentence, both in this place, where he opposeth grace to debt, and by consequence, to wages, as that cannot stand togither, and also Chap. 11. 6. where he saith, *If by grace* (to wit, there be a restitution of certaine Iewes that are iustified) *it is not now of workes, (*that is, deserts of workes) *otherwise were no more grace. But if of workes: then not now of grace: otherwise workes were no more workes.*

But *Bellarmine* hauing first set downe that generall answere, maketh answere afterward vnto euery of those sayings. And first vnto that place, *Rom.* 3. 27. he answereth, that the reioycing of the Iewes is excluded by the law of of faith, not by the law of deeds: because man is iustified of grace, which first of all inspi-

Bellarmines exception against that place, Ro. 3. 27.

» reth faith, then by faith, leadeth vnto
» mercie and good works: and is not iustifi-
» ed by the law of deeds, that is, by the only
» knowledge of the law, & strength of free
» will.

I answer. Although Gods grace whereby a man is iustified, leadeth him by faith vnto good works, yet is not in that respect man said to be iustified by faith, as *Bellarmine* insinuateth, because of faith he doth good workes, but he is said to be iustified by faith, because by faith he layeth holde on Christs satisfaction, for which only he is iustified. Moreouer, it is false, that the Apostle vnderstandeth those workes only which are done according to Gods law, by the strength of free will. For it is plain by *Abrahams* example, which he presently addeth to this sentence, by a prolepsis in the beginning of the chapter following, that he speaketh of those workes that are done of grace and faith.

» Against this answere, *Bellarmine* ex-
» cepteth: that the Apostle saith not, where
» is the reioycing? but, where is the reioy-
» cing? that is, where is the reioycing,
» wherewith thou reioycest in thy selfe, and
» not in the Lord? And of workes done of
» faith, and thereby of grace? seeing faith

is

is of grace; none can reioyce but in the Lord. Which reioycing is not forbidden, seeing the same Apostle saith, Hee that reioyceth, let him reioyce in the Lord.

I answere: That Pronowne, *thy*, is not in the Greeke. Neuertheleſſe, by the very matter it appeareth, that it muſt be vnderſtood. Then, that there is no need the Pronowne ſhould be ſo expounded as *Bellarmine* doth; for reioycing is rightly ſaid to be his that reioyceth, whether he reioyce in himſelf, or in an other. Laſtly (that which is chiefly to be marked) the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of reioycing wherewith any may truly reioyce, that he is iuſt by inherent iuſtice, bred of perfect obſeruation of the commandements of the law, whether he performe this obſeruation of naturall ſtrength, or of Gods ſingular grace. And ſuch reioycing no man hath: becauſe all haue tranſgreſſed the law, and they which begin to obſerue it by Gods ſingular grace, yet can they not (in this life) obſerue it perfectly, ſo as for that obſeruation they can be counted iuſt of God. In the meane while it is true, that it is lawfull for the godly to reioyce in the Lord: but ſo farre forth as they reioyce not falſly: and they

should falsly reioyce, if they should say that they can by Gods grace perfectly fulfill the law, so as by fulfilling thereof they may be iust before God.

The second place from *Rom.* 3.28. *Wee gather that a man is iustified by faith without the workes of the law:* Bellarmine passeth ouer in silence, and answereth nothing to it in speciall. But in the second place he answereth vnto that saying, *Rom.* 4.2. of *Abraham*: and withall, vnto the rest of the places before recited. He saith therefore, that *Abraham* was iustified by faith, not by workes that went before faith. And the same he answereth vnto the places following, *Gal.* 2, *Eph.* 2, *Tit.* 3. for in all those places, are excluded onely workes done before faith.

Exception against the other places before recited.

I answere. The Apostle derogateth Iustification not onely from those works which are done before faith, but also from those which are done after faith. For he speaketh of *Abrahams* workes, which are mentioned in scripture for to shew his vprightnesse, as, that he obeyed God, going out of his owne country, and offering his sonne. But the workes which *Abraham* did before faith, are mentioned in the scripture, not as such whereof hee might

might reioyce, but as such whereof hee might worthily be ashamed: namely, that he serued strange gods, *Iosh.* 24. 2. Also in *Gal.* 2. hee speaketh in generall of the workes of the law, wherein the Iewes exercised themselues, among whom were many regenerate, and endued with faith of Christ, as cannot be denied: although they knew not, that that Iesus of *Nazareth* was the Christ, and that iustice should be imputed to them that beleeue in him. Besides in this saying. *Gal.* 2. is to be noted the want of that expounding particle [*tout'ésti*, 1. *that is:*] which being obserued, it will be euident, that heere are contained exclusiue particles, equiualent to that exclusiue particle [*onely.*] For it is, as if he should say; *Knowing that a man is not iustified by the workes of the law:* that is, *but by the faith of Iesus Christ, &c.* And these are equiualent, *Not to be iustified but by faith,* and *to be iustified by faith onely.* Besides, although *Eph.* 2. and *Tit.* 3. hee taketh away iustification from workes done before faith, yet by this hee dooth not ascribe it to workes done after faith.

Against this answere *Bellarmine* excepteth, that the Apostle when hee saith,

» *Abraham* was iustified by faith, not by
» workes; doth not reiect the workes done
» by faith, but affirmeth them not to bee
» don without faith: for if they had bin such,
» they had neuer iustified him, therefore
» he excludeth (saith he) the workes which
» *Abraham* could haue done, not of faith.

But what is to mingle darkneſſe with the cleare light, if this be not? The Apoſtle openly denieth that *Abrahã* was iuſtified with God by works: & ſpeaketh of works don by faith, as we haue now twiſe ſhewed: and yet *Bellarmine* dareth to ſay, that the Apoſtle reiecteth not (to wit, from *Abrahams* iuſtificatiõ) works done of faith. Then what meaneth *Bellarmine* when he ſaith, the Apoſtle affirmeth that *Abrahã* works were not done without faith: for if they had bin ſuch, they had neuer iuſtified him. But where doth the Apoſtle affirme this? And doth not now *Bellarmine* cõtradict himſelfe: which affirmeth here, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *Abrahams* works done of faith: when yet before hee ſaid, in al thoſe places, ſpeech was of works done before faith? Alſo, doeth hee not ſtraightway in the words following again cõtradict himſelfe, when he ſaith, that the Apoſtle excludeth works which *Abrahã*

coud

could haue done, not of faith?

Besides, *Bellarmine* saith, that the Apostle speaketh with condition, namely thus: If *Abraham* were iustified by works not proceeding frō the grace of faith: surely he had reioycing, but not with god. And because it is manifest inough (saith he) that *Abraham* had reioycing also with god, therupon the Apostle gathereth, that he was not iustified by works without faith, but by faith whereof good workes truly proceed.

I answere. *Bellarmine* peruerteth the meaning of the Apostles words, in feigning vnto him such a syllogisme: ye openly contradicteth the Apostles words. For the Apostle denieth that *Abraham* had reioycing with God; but *Bellarmine* affirmeth it. And that *Bellarmines* syllogisme is feigned, appeareth by coherence of sentences. For when the Apostle had recited the obiection of the Iewes drawne from *Abrahams* example, as if hee had obtained the praise of iustice by woorkes: hee answereth by distinction: graunting that *Abraham* got that praise with men but not with God. Then, if in this place there were an hypotheticall or connex syllogisme, it shoulde bee such as this;

If *Abraham* were iustified by workes, he hath whereof to reioyce with God. But he hath not whereof to reioyce with God. Therefore hee was not iustified by workes.

The assumption of which syllogisme, plainely contradicteth the assumption of *Bellarmines* syllogisme: and the conclusion is diuerse from the conclusion of *Bellarmines* syllogisme; because it speaketh of workes in generall, when *Bellarmine* speaketh onely of works done without faith.

Exception against the Bellarmine and vereth place, Phil. 3.9.

Vnto the last place, from *Phil.* 3. that those workes are called the iustice of the law, which are done through knowledge of the law, by the onely strength of nature.

I answere. By that which the Apostle signifieth, that hee trusted not in the iustice of workes which hee had done by the onely strength of nature, it cannot firmely be gathered, that he trusted in the iustice of workes which hee had done of faith. Yea he openly signifieth, that hee trusted in the onely iustice of faith. And this is the iustice which is imputed to man by faith, as he teacheth *Rom.* 4.5.6. and not the iustice of workes done of

faith,

faith, inherent in a man. And in an other place speaking of this inherent iustice, he saith, *I know nothing by my selfe: but I am not hereby iustified.*

CHAP. IX.

The confirmation and clearing of the sixt part.

HItherto of the fifth part of the sentence proposed: now followeth of the sixt, that man is iustified by the grace or free loue of God; in as much as God hath of fauour to man, ordained Christ for a Mediator or satisfactor: according to these sayings. *Act.* 15. 11. *By the grace of our Lord Iesus Christ, wee beleeue that we shall be saued euen as they. Rom.* 3. 24. *Are iustified freely by his grace, by the redemptiō made in Iesus Christ. Rom.* 4. 16. *Therefore the inheritance is of faith, that it may be by grace: Rom.* 5. 15. *If by the fal of that one, many are dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Iesus Christ, hath abounded vnto many. And verse.* 17. *they which receiue the abundance of grace, and the gift of iustice shall reigne in life through one, that is,*

Iesu Christ. And verſ. 21. *So grace might reigne by iuſtice vnto eternall life, through Iesus Christ our Lord.* Rom. 11. 5. *Euen ſo at this preſent time there is a remnant according to the election of grace.* Gal. 2. 21. *I do not abrogate the grace of God. For if iuſtice be by the law, then Christ died in vaine.* Gal. 5. 4. *Yee are abolished from Christ whoſoeuer are iuſtified by the Law, ye are fallen from grace.* Eph. 1. 5. 6. 7. *Who hath predeſtinate vs to be adopted through Iesus Christ, vnto himſelfe, according to the good pleaſure of his will: to the praiſe of the glorie of his grace, wherewith he hath made vs accepted in his beloued: by whom wee haue redemption through his blood, &c.* Eph. 2. 8. *By grace ye are ſaued, &c.* Tit. 3. 7. *That wee being iuſtified by his grace, ſhould bee made heires according to the hope of eternall life.* In all theſe ſpeeches, the word *Grace*, ſignifieth the fauour of God, wherewith he accepteth his elect.

2. *Booke of iuſtification, Chap.* 3.

„ Againſt this, *Bellarmine* excepteth: „ that iuſtifying grace is not onely the fa- „ nour of God, but a gift inherent in the „ minde, as may bee vnderſtood (ſaith „ he) by the diuerſe attributes and names „ thereof. For it is called the gift „ which wee receiue, *Rom.* 5. 17. receiuing

ning the abundance of the grace and gift. Also it is said, *it be giuen by Christ. Grace and truth is made by Iesus Christ. Ioh.* 1. Now it is not rightly said, that the good wil of God the Father is made by Christ. Also it is said to be giuen of Christ by measure: *To euery one of vs is giuen grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Eph.* 4. But the good will of God is not giuen by measure, neither of Christ. Also, it is compared to the *being* which is giuen by creation. For therof we are said to be *Created in Christ, Eph.* 2. &, *a new creature. Gal.* 5. But that whereby we are said to be creatures, is inward and inherent. Finally, it is compared to the light, 2. *Cor.* 6. *What part hath iustice with iniquitie? What fellowship hath light with darknesse?* Eph. 5. *Ye were sometimes darknesse, but now are light in the Lord.* 1. Ioh. 2. *He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in darknesse.* But certes light maketh not a lucide body, except it be inherent, neither suffereth darknesse with it. Besides, the grace by which the Apostle sayth wee are iustified, is called also, *loue shead in our hearts by the holy Ghost. Rom.* 5. Also, by iustifying grace, wee are saide to

liue.

" liue. *Rom.* 8. *the spirit liueth for iustificati-*
" *on.* But wee cannot bee rightly saide
" to liue by the outward fauour of God:
" when nothing is more inward then life
" is.

I answere. *Rom.* 5. 17. *the grace* and *the gift*, of iustice are openly distinguished: therefore the gift is not there called the grace, as *Bellarmine* saith. Then, there is there no speech of inherent iustice, as *Bellarmine* would: but of the iustice which God giueth, & of the grace or fauour hee imputeth: for the Apostle speaketh of the same iustice that before, *Rom.* 4. 6. where he said, iustice was imputed.

Ioh. 1. The name of *Grace* signifieth the benefite of redemption, by a *metonymie* of the cause efficient: but thereof it followeth not, that it is taken after the same maner in the sayings rehearsed. As neither from the saying, *Eph.* 4. where the name *Grace*, signifieth some spirituall gift, profitable for the edifying of the Church. Neither yet by the other speeches, *Eph.* 2. *Gal.* 5. 2, *Cor.* 6. where the name of *Grace* is not found; neither is the speech of iustification, but of regeneration. And in that saying, *Rom.* 5.

Loue

Loue is shead, &c, is not meant the loue which is inherent, in vs, and wherewith wee loue God; but wherewith God loued vs: as is plaine by comparing it with the 8. verse, where it is said, *God commendeth his loue towards vs, &c.* Finally, *Rom.* 8. 10. hee speaketh not of iustification, but of sanctification, neither is there the name *Iustification* as *Bellarmine* falsly alleageth; but the name of *Iustice*; whereby is there meant, a iust and holy life: as may appeare by the whole context and scope of that place: and not that iustice whereby a man standeth before the iudgement seate of GOD; the disputation of which matter, the Apostle finished in the end of the fift Chapter.

CHAP. X.

The confirmation of the seuenth part.

THere remaineth the seuenth part of the sentence propounded, to wit, that man is iustified by the iustice of God, whereby he accepteth Christs satisfaction for the elect. Of this *Paule* testifieth

testifieth. Rom. 3. 25. 26. Where he saith, *Whom* (to wit Christ) *God hath set forth to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood to declare his iustice, by the forgiuenesse of the sinnes that are past through the patience of God, to shew at this time his iustice, that he might be iust and a iustifier of him which is of the faith of Iesus.* By which words the Apostle teacheth, that God declareth his iustice, in as much as he forgiueth sinnes to them for whom Christ hath satisfied, namely the beleeuers. For it is the part of iustice, to be content, if satisfaction bee made for the debt by a suretie, and not to exact satisfaction of the debter himselfe.

THE

THE SECOND Booke of Iustification.

VVherein the opinion of the Papists, and proofs of the same, are recited out of Bellarmines Booke, and refuted.

CHAP. I.

The Papists opinion recited: which consisteth of foure points.

Hitherto hath bene the first part of our entended disputation, the opinion of the professors of the Gospell, touching *Iustification*: the other part followeth, to wit, the opinion of the Papists.

The Papists opinion and sentence therefore, *Bellarmine* deliuereth in these words (in the Booke of *Iustification*, Chapter 2.) that Iustification is the infusion of inherent iustice.

Also

» Also (in the same booke, Chap. 3.) that it » is a regeneration and renewing through » the goodnesse of God, made in vs by the » lauer of Baptisme and sheading out of the » holy Ghost. Inherent iustice he maketh » to consist in faith, hope and charitie: (in » the same booke, Chap. 2.) yet in an other » place (1. booke of *Iustice*, Chap. 2.) in cha- » ritie onely. Therefore (in the same booke » Chap. 13. and 2. booke, Chap. 4.) that » faith iustifieth, not onely, but as the be- » ginning and first roote of Iustification. » Also (2. booke of Iustification. Chap. 6.) » that iustification consisteth not in onely » forgiuenesse of sinnes. Finally, (in the » same booke, Chap. 7.) that Iustification consisteth not in imputation of Christes iustice. All which things how he endeuoureth to proue, let vs see after.

CHAP. II.

The proofe of the first part recited and refuted.

TO proue the first part, *That Iustification is the infusion of inherent iustice*, he bringeth these arguments.

1. *Argument.* The first argument (saith he) is ta- ken

ken from these words of the Apostle, *Rom. 5. As by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one, many shall be made iust.* Hence *Bellarmine* inferreth, that we are made iust by obteining inherent iustice, both for that the Apostle saith, *shall be made iust*: and also, for that he saith, *we are so made iust by Christes obedience, as we were made vniust by Adams disobedience.* But by *Adams* disobedience we are made vniust, by iniustice cleauing within vs indeede.

2 Books of iustificatiō chapt. 3.

I answere, It soloweth not: we are made iust; therefore by obteining inherent iustice: because we may be made iust by imputation of iustice. And indeede the Apostle teacheth that we are made iust so, *Rom. 4. 6.* where he saith, that *Dauid* affirmed *the blessednesse of the man to whome God imputeth iustice.* But that comparison of the Apostle, is wrested to a wrong sense: for the Apostle would say; As vnto all naturally borne of *Adam* iniustice is imputed for his disobedience: so to all that beleeue in Christ, and belong vnto Christ, iustice is imputed for his obedience, to wit, wherewith hee obeyed his father, in suffering the punishment for them. And although it is true,

that Christ by that his obedience, hath obteined also that iustice is infused into the elect by the regeneration of the holy Ghost; as *Adam* by his disobedience caused that iniustice is infused into his posteritie by carnal generation? neuertheless the Apostle speaketh not heere of that thing, because heere he handleth not regeneration (which he handleth in the 6. 7. and 8. chapters) but iustification.

2. *Argument.*

The second argument for inherent iustice, *Bellarmine* taketh frō *Rom.* 3. *Iustified freely by his grace.* That is (saith *Bellarmine*) by iustice giuen & infused of him.

I answere with them of sound iudgement: that by the name *grace*, here is not meant any infused or inherent gift, but Gods fauour and good wil which he beareth towards vs. As in many other places in this disputation: as is to be seene in the sayings recited before, for to confirme the first part of the sentence of the professors of the Gospell.

Against this answere *Bellarmine* excepteth: that gods fauour is explained inough by that word, *freely*: in that addition therefore, *by grace*, is signified the effect of his fauour. Then (saith he) the preposition *per*, *by*, is not rightly applied to fauour, that

is be said, God by his fauour iustifieth vs. »
Moreouer, the good will of God effe- »
eteth that good which it willeth to any: »
and Gods will is that we be truly iust and »
holy before him. »

I answere. Although Gods fauour be signified ynough by the word [*dorean, a. freely*] yet because by that aduerb there is not expressed the author of this gift whereof we speake, it pleased the Apostle for more full declaration sake to adde, *tê autoû charitι*, by, (or *through*) *his*, (that is, Gods) *grace*, by a certaine apposition. Then, *Bellarmine* assumeth fallly, that the Apostle heere vseth the preposition *per*, *i. by*. Moreouer he frameth a false position, when he saith the preposition *per*, *i. by*, is not rightly applied to fauour. For the cõtrary is gathered by th'Apostles words *Eph.* 1. 6. where he saith, *to the praise of the glory of his grace, in which (en hê) he hath made vs accepted, &c.* Heere it is certaine, by the name *grace*, is vnderstood the fauour or good will of God: for this is the subiect of the praise whereof the Apostle treateth. Then, this also is manifest, that [*en hê*] *in which*, is put by an hebrue proprietie, for [*di' hes*] *by which*. Lastly, the good will of God effecteth

in deed, that we be truly holy: but it effecteth not that we be perfectly holy in this life, so as that we can stand in the iudgemẽt of God by the holinesse inherent in vs: but effecteth that we are counted for perfectly holy, for the redemption made by Christ: of which benefit the Apostle here properly speaketh, as appeareth by his words.

3. Argument. „ The third argument he taketh from
„ 1. Cor. 6. *And such were ye, but ye are washed,*
„ *but ye are sanctified, but ye are iustified.*
„ Hence *Bellarmine* inferreth, that iustification conteineth these two: purgation
„ or washing, and sanctification.

I answere. This consequence cannot be firmely drawen frõ the Apostles words. Then this is not the Apostles mind, that sanctificatiõ is part of iustification: which may be gathered by this, that in the Epistle to the *Romanes*, hauing ended the disputation about Iustification, he treateth of Sanctification apart by it selfe, to wit, in the 6, 7. and 8. chapters. And those three things by the sentence of the Apostle, are thus compared among themselues. First by the word *washing*, he signifieth in generall, metaphorically both the benefits of Christ, to wit, sanctification & iusti-

iustification: which afterwards he addeth for speciall explication sake. Moreouer, the things that *Bellarmine* in this place doth further inferre from those words, against forgiuenesse of sinnes, and imputation of iustice, shall more fitly be answered otherwhere.

The 4. argument he taketh from *Tit.* 3. » *When the bounty & humanity of God our Sa-* » *uiour appeared: not by works which we did,* » *but according to his mercy he saued vs, by the* » *lauer of regeneration and renouation of the* » *holy Ghost, which he hath shed into vs abun-* » *dantly through Iesus Christ our Sauiour: that* » *being iustified by his grace, we may be heires* » *according to the hope of eternal life.* From » those last words, *that being iustified by his* » *grace*, we vnderstād (saith *Bellarmine*) that » iustification is described in the former » words: so that, after the Apostles mind, iu- » stificatioo is regeneration and renouation » through the goodnesse of God wrought » in vs by the lauer of Baptisme, and pow- » ring out of the holy Ghost. Also, in those » words, *that being iustified by his grace, &c.* » he sheweth the cause (saith he) why God » hath regenerate & renued vs by the lauer » and holy Ghost: and saith, the cause was, » *that being iustified*, that is, being iustified »

by that regeneration and renouation, *we may deserue to be made heyres of the kingdome and life euerlasting.*

I answere. *Bellarmine* as his manner is, confoundeth and taketh for one and the same, the things which in the Apostle are manifestly diuerse: to wit, regeneration and iustification; and to obteine this, he giueth a glosse vpon those words, *that being iustified*: saying, *that is to say, that being iustified by that regeneration*: which glosse notwithstanding might be admitted, if it were rightly vnderstood, namely of the procreant cause of faith, and not of the formall cause of iustification. For by regeneration, the holy Ghost worketh faith in the elect, whereby they apprehend the grace of Christ, that is, Christs satisfaction through Gods grace performed for them. And this is it which the Apostle saith in this place, *that being iustified by his grace, &c.* That is to say, hauing by regeneration the gift of faith, we apprehend the grace of Christ, and so are iustified, and obteine the inheritance of eternall life.

5. Argument. The 5. argument he taketh frō *Heb.* 11. where the Apostle testifieth (saith he) that some men were truly and absolutely iust:

for

for of *Abel* he writeth, *He obteyned testimonie that he was iust.* Of *Noah*, *Hee was made heyre of the iustice which is by faith.* And this their iustice (saith *Bellarmine* further) was not the iustice of Christ imputed: but iustice inherent and proper to them. For the Apostle willing to shew, from whence *Abel* obteined testimonie of iustice, saith, *God giuing testimonie to his gifts.* Where we see, that *Abels* iustice is proued by the effect of his iustice; to wit, because hee did good works, when he sacrificed vnto God aright. Now the cause of a good worke is inherent iustice, not imputation of iustice: which seeing it is outward, cannot be the beginning of the worke. So also that *Noe* was iust, the Apostle prooueth in the same place: *Because hee beleeued God, feared Gods iudgement, obeyed Gods commaundement.* And in *Genes. 6.* he is sayd to be iust, because *he walked with God.* Euen as also Saint *Luke* prooueth (Chapter. 1.) that *Zacharie* and *Elizabeth* were *iust before God*, because *they walked in all the commaundements and iustifications of the Lord.*

I answere. The fraud of *Bellarmine* is to be marked, who that he might wrest that place of *Abel* to his purpose, reciteth it vnperfitly: leauing out these two words *By which*, which do agree in the same sentence with those words which he citeth, and pertaine greatly vnto the question in hand. For so saith the Apostle: *Abel by faith offered a more pretious sacrifice then Cain*, By which, *he obteined testimonie that he was iust, God bearing witnesse of his gifts.* Where it is manifest, that faith is made the procreant cause both of the pretiousnes of *Abels* sacrifice, and also of *Abels* iustice, and lastly also of the testimonie, whereby God bare witnesse that *Abel* was iust by faith, and therefore that his sacrifice was pretious and pleased him. Wherefore it is plaine, that here he speaketh of the iustice of faith. Which thing appeareth yet more manifestly by the other testimonie, namely, that *Noe was made heyre of the iustice which is by faith.* Which testimonie it is strange that *Bellarmine* would cite heere, seeing it plainly repugneth his purpose. For *the iustice of faith*, is the iustice which God imputeth to man, as is euident by the words of

the

the same Apostle, *Rom. 4. 6. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth iustice.* Moreouer, *Bellarmine* feigneth a false drift of the Apostles words; as though he would proue, that *Abel* was iust: and as though he proued it by this, that he did a good worke, by sacrificing a right. But the Apostle hath an other purpose, namely, by *Abels* example to proue, that both man himselfe and his workes please God by faith. Besides he falsly denieth, that imputed iustice is the cause of a iust worke. For except iustice be imputed to a man by faith, no worke of his can please God and be approued as *Iust*. For *without faith* (as the Apostle there saith) *it is impossible to please God*. Neither doth it hinder, that imputation of iustice (as *Bellarmine* speaketh) is outward. For faith, by which iustice is imputed to man, is (that I may so say) inward, that is, seated within: and this is it which worketh by loue. But as concerning those places, *Gen. 6.* of *Noe*, and *Luke. 1.* of *Zacharie* and *Elizabeth*; their begun inherent iustice, is there commended, by the adioyned sinceritie: to wit, for that they minded, that God was the beholder of all their actions: and thereupon studied to approue them vn-

to him: and it is not meant, that they trusted vpon that iustice of their life before God, as being perfect, and in all things answerable to his law, for which eternall life ought to be adiudged them of God.

6. Argument. » The 6. Argument hee taketh from » *Rom.* 8. 29. and 1. *Cor.* 15. 49. where » the Apostle saith, *that the iust are conformed to the Image of Christ, & beare Christs Image, Those whom he fore-knew* (saith he) » *them he predestinated to be made conformable to the Image of his sonne.* And *as we haue* » *borne the Image of the earthy, we shall beare* » *also the Image of the heauenly.* *Bellarmine* » allumeth: now Christ is not iust by imputation, but by iustice inherent to himselfe. He concludeth: therefore it is necessarie, that wee also haue inherent iustice.

Here first *Bellarmine* vseth a fallacie from that which is spoken in respect, vnto that which is spoken simplie: whiles he taketh those speeches of the Apostle, which are spoken properly of the conformitie of the beleeuers with Christ in glorie, as if they were spoken of cõformitie in all things. For otherwise he could not thence inferre, that wee ought to be conformed vnto Christ euen in this also,

that

that we be not iust by imputation. Then he deceitfully leaueth out in the conclusion, the one part of the assumption: when as the whole conclusion is thus: therefore we also are not iust by imputation, but by inherent iustice.

The first part of which conclusion manifestly contradicteth the Apostle, who saith, *Rom. 4. The man is blessed to whom God imputeth iustice.* Finally that conclusion of *Bellarmines*, maketh nothing for the question in hand. For the question is not, whither it be necessarie that we haue inherent iustice: but whether by inherent iustice wee can stand in Gods iudgement and be iustified of God.

But *Bellarmine* proceedeth to reason from that place to the Corinthes thus: "Wee haue borne the true Image of the "earthly man, that is, of the sinner *Adam*: "because sinne cleaued in vs not putatiuely, but in truth and in deed: Therefore we beare also Christs true Image, if "iustice cleaue in vs, not putatiuely, but in "truth and in deed.

Here *Bellarmine* deceitfully in stead of the word *Imputation*, putteth as equall thereto, the word *Putation*: saying

putatiuely.

putatiuely, for imputatiuely: that he might note a certaine vaine opinion, whereunto no matter subsisteth. Yet in the meane while *Bellarmine* is not ignorant, that not onely the sinne which dwelleth in man since the fall, is deriued from *Adam* vnto his posteritie by generation: but also that first sinne committed properly by *Adam*, is imputed to his posteritie. And by like reason, not onely inherent iustice, that is, study of godlinesse in those that belong vnto Christ, is wrought by Christ through regeneration of the holy Ghost: but also that obedience of Christ, whereby he satisfied for the sinnes of the elect, is imputed vnto thē for the iustice whereby they stand before God. Moreouer, he concludeth not heere the question, which is not, whether wee shall beare Christes Image as touching inherent iustice: for no professor of the Gospell denieth this: but the question is, whether by this iustice we can stand in the iudgement of God.

7. Argument. „ The 7. argument hee draweth from „ *Rom. 6.* where the Apostle teacheth „ (saith he) that we through Iustification, „ whereby we die to sinne, and rise againe „ to iustice, do represent Christs death and resurrectio.

resurrection. And amongst other things saith, *He that is dead, is iustified from sinne.* Which also the Apostle *Peter* signified in his first Epistle, Chap. 4. when he saith, *Christ therefore hauing suffered in the flesh, be ye also armed with the same minde. For he that hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sinnes.* But Christ was not putatiuely, but truly dead, & truly rose again: therefore we also do not putatiuely but truly die to sinne, and rise againe to iustice, when wee are iustified by Baptisme.

I answere. First it is false, that the Apostle in *Rom.* 6. teacheth, that wee by Iustification do represent Christs death and resurrection. For hee treateth not there of Iustification, hauing made an end of that dispute in in the 5. Chapter: but he treateth of sanctification or regeneration. Neither can it bee proued otherwise, from those words: *He that is dead, is iustified from sinne.* For the Apostle speaketh not there of mans Iustification before God, but vseth the word *Iustified* for *Freed*, by a synechdoche of the *species*. For euery one that is iustified, that is to say, is quitted by the Iudge, is freed: to wit, from punishment: but euery

gery one that is freed, is not iustified: for one may be freed from some other thing then from punishment; as, from sinne. And of this freeing saith the Apostle: *He that is dead is iustified from sinne*: for because hee that is dead cannot worke either good or euill. Therefore beleeuers in so much as they are dead to sinne, (as the Apostle there saith, verse, 11.) so farforth they are freed from sinne. Euen as a seruant by death is freed from his maister, that he serue him not any more hereafter, as the Apostle saith in the words immediately going before, *That our old man is crucified with Christ, that the body of sinne may be weakened, that hereafter we serue sinne no more*. Then it is true, that wee do truly die to sinne and rise againe to iustice: but the question is not of this thing: but is, whether by this spirituall death and resurrection (that is to say, inherent iustice) we be iustified before God. Finally *Bellarmine* comprehendeth more in the conclusion, then followeth of the premisses: where he saith *When we are iustified by faith*: in which very thing hee beggeth the question. For the Apostle saith not in the place cited: that we are iustified by Baptisme: seeing hee handleth

nothing

nothing there of *Iustification*: but teacheth, that Baptisme is a testimonie of our regeneration; which is wrought by the holy Ghost, in as much as it teacheth vs of Christs death and resurrection. For if being taught by the holy Ghost, we beleeue that Christ died for our sinnes, and rose againe vnto heauenly life, as our first fruites and head: certainly wee will study to auoyde sinnes, and will meditate an heauenlie and an holie life.

The 8. Argument hee taketh from Rom. 8. where the Apostle (saith *Bellarmine*) writeth, *That wee now by Christ haue receiued the spirit of adoption of sonnes of God, as touching the soule, which liueth (as there is said) because of Iustification: though the body be dead, (that is, be yet mortall) because of sinne.* But by and by after hee addeth (to wit, the Apostle) *that we now hauing the first fruites of the spirit, doo sigh in our selues, expecting the adoption of the sonnes of God, the redemption of our body.* For as the same Apostle saith, *Phil. 3. Wee expect a Sauiour which will reforme the body of our humilitie, configured to the body of his glory.* 8. Argument.

But

But the adoption of sonnes which we expect in the redemption of our body, shall be most true and inherent in the body: that is, immortalitie, and impassibilitie, not imputatiue, but true. Therefore the adoption which now we haue in the spirit by Iustification, ought also to be true, not putatiue. Otherwise as we expect the redemption of the body, so also we expect the redemption of the soule.

I answere. First *Bellarmine* faulteth in a false exposition: in as much as he taketh the name *body* simplie for the body of man: and contrariwise, the name *spirit* for the soule. For the Apostle there by the name *body*, vnderstandeth that which in that and other places hee calleth *flesh*: that is, the body together with the soule, but such as it is by carnall generation; and likewise by the name *spirit*, he vnderstandeth the soule with the body; but so far forth as the soule is regenerate by the holy Ghost.

Next, he faulteth in false citation: for the Apostle writeth not, *The soule liueth because of Iustification*; but *The spirit is life, because of Iustice*. Then againe he faulteth in false exposition; in as much as he expoũdeth those words, *The body is dead,*

to

so meane, *Is yet mortall*: when the Apostles meaning is, that by the holy Ghost dwelling in the beleeuers, it commeth to passe that their flesh is mortified as touching sinne; to wit so, as that it sinne not: and the spirite is quickned as concerning iustice, to wit so, as that it endeuoureth for iustice and worketh it. That this is the meaning of those words, may plainly appeare to any that marketh, by the words their next ensuing. Moreouer *Bellarmines* sophisme, from a like reason of the adoption of the body, and the adoption of the soule, is vtterly darke, and farre from the Apostles words and meaning. For neither doth the Apostle say, the adoption to come in the body; nor yet, that wee now haue adoption in the spirit; that is, in the soule: neither doth hee compare these two adoptions as like one to an other. But hee sayth, *Wee expect the adoption of the sonnes of God*: that is to say, that heauenly inheritance, which wee are adopted to possesse and enioy in due time. And this very thing hee calleth *redemption of the body*: that is to say, redemption, whereby both the body shall be deliuered from

the crosse whereto it is subiect in this life; and the soule, from inhabiting sinne, wherein it is holden, so long as it liueth in this mortall body. Wherefore it is vnapt, and not beseeming a Diuine, that *Bellarmine* counteth this an absurd thing, that we should looke for redemption of the soule. For that lamentation of *Paule*, *Rom. 7.24. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliuer me from this body of death!* doth it not pertaine to the ful deliuerance of the soule from inhabiting sinne. Finally, it is a true, and not a putatiue adoption (as *Bellarmine* cauelling speaketh) wherewith God hath adopted vs: and yet the adoption, is the imputation of sonneship, whereby wee are counted for the sonnes of God through grace: when by nature wee were the children of wrath. But in the meane time, *adoption* is one thing, *the spirit of adoption* an other thing. By adoption we are receiued into grace, and iustified: by the spirit of adoption, we are regenerate, beeing already adopted.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The proofe of the second part recited and refuted.

HItherto we haue disputed of the first part of the Papists opinion, wherin they determine, that Iustification is infusion of iustice.

It followeth that now wee treate of the second parte, wherein they say, *That faith alone iustifieth not, but is the beginning and roote of Iustification.*

To proue this, *Bellarmine* first bringeth the place, *Heb.* 11. *He that commeth vnto God, must beleeue that God is.* Where the first motion vnto God, is giuen to faith; by which he that was far off, beginneth now to draw nigh.

I answere. The Apostle here maketh no comparison betweene faith and other spirituall vertues: but speaking simplie of faith alone, affirmeth it to be necessarie for him that commeth vnto God, to wit, to craue his helpe, and aske any thing of him. Wherfore it is a strange glosse, that the first motion vnto God is here giuen to faith.

The I. Argument of the proofe wherof doth consist.

I. *Argument.*

I. *Booke of Iustificatio Chap.* 13.

As though the motions that follow, were not of faith, but of other spiritual vertues: And as though Iustification were done by I know not how many motions vnto God. Nay, Iustification is made by this onely motion, whereby the mind through faith is so moued vnto God, that it taketh hold of his good will, reconciled by Christs satisfaction to all that beleeue in him.

2. Argument. „ Then hee bringeth the saying *Rom.* „ 10. *Whosoeuer shall call vpon the name of* „ *the Lord, shall be saued. But how shall they* „ *call vpon him, in whome they haue not beleeued? how shall they beleeue without a Preacher? how shall they preach except they be* „ *sent?* Where the Apostle describeth this „ order of iustification, that first there be a „ sending of Preachers: secondly, the preaching of the Gospell: thirdly, faith: fourthly, inuocation: fifthly, saluation: that is, *Iustification*, which is health of soule, from „ the disease of sinne. Of which sending and preaching, are without vs: „ and add to the first beginning of *Iustification* in vs, is faith: after which followeth inuocation, and the rest in their order.

Answere. *Bellarmine* faulteth first in confusion of things distinct, in that he

expoundeth

expoundeth the word *Saluation*, by the word *Iustification*: when as Saluation properly spoken, is more large, to wit, comprehending iustification, regeneration, and glorification. Then hee faulteth in a false definition: when as hee defineth Iustification to bee health of soule from the disease of sinne: that is to say, regeneration. Finally, he goeth from the question, in that hee numbreth certaine things which be needfull vnto saluation besides faith. For when the professors of the Gospell teach, that man is iustified by faith onely: they exclude not those things that are here reckoned, from the obtaining of saluation: but only they exclude mans workes from obtaining that iustice which God may approoue as perfect.

3. Argument.

Thirdly, he bringeth the place *Iohn.* 1. *So many as receiued him, he gaue them power to be made the sons of God, to those that beleeue in his name.* Here *Iohn* openly teacheth (saith *Bellarmine*) that they which receiue Christ by faith, are not yet the sons of God, but may so be made, if they go on further, that they also begin to hope and loue. For loue properly maketh the sonnes of God, as appeareth, 1. *Iohn.* 2.

I answere. The meaning of *Iohns* words is not that which *Bellarmine* bringeth: but he meaneth, that God hath giuen to the beleeuers power or right [*exousian*] *for to be made the sonnes of God, that is, to be the sonnes of God*, in this very respect, that they are borne of God (as he declareth in the verse following) that is, that they are regenerate, and by consequence endued with faith. Whence I draw this Argument:

As farre forth as the beleeuers are borne of God, so farre forth is giuen vnto them the right of the children of God.

But the beleeuers as far forth as they beleeue, are borne of God.

Therefore to the beleeuers as far forth as they beleeue, is giuen the right of the children of God: and by consequence, they are iustified as far forth as they beleeue, or by faith.

And whereas *Bellarmine* saith, it is plaine by 1. *Ioh.* 2. that loue properly maketh the sonnes of God: verily I find not this sentence in that Chapter, neither expressly, nor yet by collection: But if perhaps through the Printers fault, the number second crept in for the nũber third, there is indeed in the third Chapter a certain

sentence

sentence of loue, but not this, *That loue maketh the sonnes of God*; but, *that by loue the sonnes of God are knowne*: namely in the 10. verse. *By this are manifested the sonnes of God, and the sonnes of the diuell: Who so doth not iustice, is not of God, and he that loueth not his brother.* Neither can *Bellarmines* sentence be concluded (as hee peraduenture thinketh) from the 1. *verse*, where it is said thus, *Behold what loue the father hath giuen to vs, that we should be called the sonnes of God.* For by the name *Loue* there, by a *metonymie* of the efficient cause, he vnderstandeth a benefit proceeding from the loue wherewith God loueth vs: and what that benefit is, he declareth by opposition in those words, *that we should be called the sonnes of God*: namely, the benefit of adoption. Wherefore *Bellarmine* hath not yet shewed, that we are adopted and iustified of GOD by loue, and therefore not by faith onely.

To these Arguments *Bellarmine* addeth a naturall reason, as hee calleth it in these words. Some man may beleeue that which he hopeth not for, neither loueth: he cannot hope for, or loue that which he beleeueth not. Therefore faith is the

"4. Argument.

foundation of hope and loue: and not contrariwise, hope or loue, the foundation of faith.

Answere. In this reason, the question is not concluded. Which is not, whether faith be the foundation or originall of hope and loue: but whether we be iustified by faith only, or by faith hope and loue together.

5. *Argument.* Vnto this reason he ioyneth an other: „ in bodily diseases the beginning of health is, to beleeue that he is sicke, and to haue „ faith in the Phisitian that is willing to „ cure: yet is not that onely faith perfect „ health.

Answere. First *Bellarmine* vnaptly maketh the sick mans faith a part of health, whē as it is the procreant cause of health: in as much as the sick man should not obtaine health, except he had that faith. In like manner faith whereby we are iustified, is not a part of Iustification: but the procreant instrumental cause, because by faith we apprehend Christs satisfaction, for which we are iustified. Next as his manner is, he confoundeth iustification with regeneration: in as much as hee calleth faith *health*, to wit, of soule, vnderstanding newnesse of nature.

Moreouer,

Moreouer, he falsly defineth faith whereby we are iustified: to wit, as though by it we beleeued only, that we are spiritually sick, that is to say, sinners: and that the spirituall physitian Christ, is willing to cure vs. But these suffice not vnto iustifying faith: but it is required further, that we beleeue that Christ hath already perfectly cured vs by his satisfaction, as touching forgiuenesse of sinnes: and hath begun to cure vs, as touching renuing of nature: and finally, as touching the same, is willing perfectly to cure vs, and also will cure vs after this life. Wherefore there is not the like reason of the faith which *Bellarmine* in this place attributeth to a sick man, and of iustifying faith.

Bellarmine proceedeth vnto the second disposition (as he after the Councell of *Trent* nameth it) whereby they feigne a man is disposed vnto iustification, that is to say, *Feare*. And indeuoureth to proue by the places of scripture following, that this concurreth vnto iustification, almost after the same manner that faith it selfe concurreth.

Bellarmines arguments, that feare concurreth vnto iustification.

First (saith he) we haue learned by the Apostle, that faith iustifieth, when hee saith, *Without faith it is impossible to please* 1. *Argument.*

God, Hebr. 11. But the same is also said of Feare; *Ecclesiasticus*, 1. *He that is without feare, cannot be iustified.*

I answere. First, the testimonie of *Ecclesiasticus* is not of force to proue any poynt of faith: because that booke is not Canonicall, but Apocryphall. Then, though that booke were of authoritie, yet the saying alleadged would proue nothing: because here is brought a false interpretation, which containeth a plain diuerse sentence frō that which is cōtained in the Greek words of Iesus the son of *Sirach*; which are to be interpreted, *an angry man cannot be iustified: for the moment of his anger is ruine vnto him.* Thirdly, although it were so in the Greek as *Bellarmine* citeth out of the common translation; yet this speech would make nothing to the purpore for the son of *Sirach* speaketh not of mans iustificatiō before God; but before the ciuill Iudge warning, that they which are giuen to anger, or that without the feare of God follow their owne lusts, will at length commit those haynous sinnes and wickednesses, for which beeing brought vnto iudgement, they cannot be iustified, that is quitted: but are by the Iudge condemned vnto deserued

punish-

punishment. Fourthly, although this saying of *Syrach* were to be vnderstood of Iustification before God: yet could not the question bee concluded from it.

For it is brought as beeing like to that saying of the Apostle: and from that likenesse, is the Argument drawne: when as notwithstanding it is not like. For it is not said, *Without feare* it is *impossible to be iustified*; as it is said, *Without faith it is impossible to please God*: but it is said, *Hee that is without feare, cannot bee iustified*. Besides, though it were said *Without feare it is impossible to be iustified*, as it is said, *without faith it is impossible to please God*.: yet would it not follow from hence, that feare would pertaine vnto Iustification, after one and the same manner that faith dooth: for faith pertaineth to Iustification, as the instrumentall cause whereby wee take holde on Christes satisfaction, for which wee are iustified: but the feare of GOD pertaineth as an effect of faith, necessarily agreeing therewith. For where the feare of GOD is not, neither is there iustyfying faith.

Then,

2. *Argument.* „ Then, faith iustifieth (saith *Bellarmine*) „ because it is the beginning of iustice and „ saluation: But the feare of the Lord is the „ beginning of wisedome, *Prou.* 1. and by „ wisdome is vnderstood perfect iustifica„ tion.

I answere. First it is false, that by wisedome is vnderstood iustification, for iustification is Gods action, whereby he counteth and pronounceth man iust: but wisedome is a qualitie in mans minde, wrought of God. Wherefore that saying maketh nothing to the matter. Next, if by the name of wisedome in *Salomons* speech, were vnderstoode iustification, *Bellarmine* assumeth things that manifestly cannot stand together, and feigneth them vnto the holy Ghost that speaketh in the scripture: in as much as he affirmeth both faith and feare to be the beginning of iustification. For if faith be the beginning of iustification, feare cannot be: and so contrariwise, seeing of one thing, there is but one beginning.

3. *Argument.* „ Moreouer, faith iustifieth (saith *Bellarmine*) „ because by it we seeke God, and „ come vnto him. But the same thing doth „ feare. For it is written in *Psal.* 77. *When he* „ *slew them, they sought him and returned, &c*

I

I answere. *Bellarmine* assumeth a false thing: for faith iustifieth not, because by it we seeke God: but because by it we take hold on Christes satisfaction, for which God iustifieth vs. Which thing cannot be attributed vnto feare.

Furthermore, faith iustifieth (saith *Bellarmine*) because by it Christ is formed in vs, as he saith, *Gal.* 4. But of feare, *Isaiah* writeth, chapt. 26. according to the 70. Greeke interpreters, *By thy feare we haue conceiued, and brought forth the spirit of saluation.* 4. *Argument.*

I answere. First it is false, that it is said in *Gal.* 4. Faith iustifieth because by it Christ is formed in vs. Yet it is true, that this sentence may be concluded from the Apostles words, which are: *My little children, of whom I trauel in birth againe, vntill Christ be formed in you.* By which words the Apostle signifieth, that he went about by the doctrine of the Gospell to reduce the *Galathians* to the true knowledge and faith of Christ. And the scope was, that by that faith they might be iustified; in as much as by it they should take hold on Chustes satisfaction. Which taking hold, the Apostle metaphorically calleth a forming of Christ in the *Galathians:*

thians: because he had said, that hee trauelled in birth againe of them: that so he might continue the metaphor hee had begun. But such forming of Christ in man, cannot be ascribed vnto feare. Neither can that any way be prooued from that saying of *Isaiah:* in the citing whereof hitherto, *Bellarmine* bewrayeth his marueilous impudencie: seeing that place containeth nothing at all of Christ or iustification: no not though the interpretation of the 70. be admitted. But why doth not *Bellarmine* cite the common Latin translation; when as notwithstanding hee approoueth and defendeth the decree of the Councell of *Trent*; wherin is determined, that the common Latin edition is to be held for authenticall? 2. Booke *De Verbo Dei*, Chap. 10. For if that be authenticall, that which differeth from it cannot be coũted for authentical. And the interpretation of the 70. differeth in this place.

But if one looke into that place, and consider the whole context, hee shall see, that there is nothing at all of Christes or mans iustification before God, contained in those words: but a narration of the Iewes, wherein they tell their owne weaknesse in deliuering themselues from calamities,

calamities, and purchasing themselues salvation.

Their calamities they compare to a woman in trauell, saying: *As a woman with child, that draweth neere to the trauell, is in sorrow, and crieth in her paines, so haue we been in thy sight ô Lord: We haue conceiued, we haue borne in paine, as though wee should haue brought forth wind; We could not giue any helpe to the Land.* It is therfore an impudent sophisme of *Bellarmine*: who shameth not to alleadge these things here, as being spoken of mans Iustification.

Againe, faith Iustifieth (saith *Bellarmine*) because *the iust liueth by faith.* Hab. 2. And of feare it is written, *The feare of the Lord is the fountaine of life.* Prou. 14.

I answere. It is false, that faith iustifieth, because, or in as much as the Iust liueth by faith. Neither doth *Habacuck* say this, but onely saith, *The iust shall liue by faith.* Yea contrariwise, the iust shall liue by faith, because hee is iustified by faith. For iustice goeth before life, as the cause before the effect. And faith Iustifieth, because, or in as much as it apprehendeth Christs satisfaction, for which God iustifieth.

To

6. Argument. „ To conclude, faith iustifieth (saith *Bellarmine*) because it purgeth sinnes, as the „ Apostle teacheth, *Act.* 13. *Rom.* 3. *Gal.* 3. „ and in other places: But of feare also we „ reade, *Ecclesiast.* 1. *The feare of the Lord expelleth sinne.*

I answere. Faith, to speake properly, purgeth not sinnes, but Christes bloud, 1. *Iohn.* 1. And if faith be said to purge sinnes, it is to be vnderstood thus, that it apprehendeth Christes satisfaction vnto forgiuenesse of sinnes. But after this manner the feare of the Lord doth not expell sinne: but so farre as it holdeth a man like a bridle, from giuing himselfe vp to sinne, and sinning securely. Neither is it said in any of the places alleaged, that faith purgeth sinnes. But *Act.* 15. 9. *Peter* saith, *that God had purged the harts of the beleeuing Gentiles by faith*: that is, had forgiuen them their sinnes by faith, whereby they apprehended Christs satisfaction. In *Rom.* 3. 25. it is said, *That God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation by faith in his bloud, to declare his iustice by forgiuenesse of foredone sins.* In *Gal.* 3. there is no such thing.

7. Argument. „ Last of all he addeth this reason: The „ nature of feare is (saith he) to flee euil, and

and seeke remedies how it may escape them.

I answere, But hence it followeth not that feare iustifieth; and ther after the same maner that faith doth.

Bellarmine proceedeth to the third disposition, as he calleth it, to wit, *Hope*, namely, hope to obtaine pardon. That this is a disposition vnto iustice and remission of sinnes, he proueth by these sayings, *Prou.* 28. *He that hopeth in the Lord, shall be healed*, *Psal.* 36. *He will saue them, for asmuch as they hoped in him*. *Psal.* 90. *Because he hoped in me, I will deliuer him*. *Mat.* 9 *Haue confidence sonne, thy sinnes are forgiuen thee*: where he noteth, that the Lord first saith, *Haue confidence sonne*: and when he saw him lifted vp vnto the hope of saluation, he added, *Thy sinnes are forgiuen thee*.

Bellarmines arguments, that hope of pardon is a disposition vnto iustice and remission of sinnes.

I answere. First, *Bellarmine* strayeth from the question. For the question proposed is, whether onely faith iustifieth, and not, whether it onely dispose vnto iustification: wherefore he should proue, that hope also iustifieth, and not, that hope disposeth vnto iustification. Moreouer, the sayings all caged out of the Prouerbs and Psalmes, make nothing to the matter: for none of them speake of the

declaring of the forgiuenes of sinnes, but they speake of outward felicitie, and deliuerance from outward dangers. Neither is there in that place of the Prouerbs, in the Hebrue, the word *healed*: but *Iadagnu*, *shall be made fat*. Neither in the 130. Psalme, or after the Hebrues diuision, the 91. Psalme, is the Hebrue; *because he hoped in me*: but *because he hath loued me*, or, *borne louingly affected vnto me*. Finally, in none of these places is there speech of hope of obtaining pardon, of which the question was propounded: but there is speech of hope of the fatherly prouidence and care of God towards his children. Now as touching that saying, *Matth. 9. Bellarmine* wresteth it vnto his purpose, by a false interpretation of the word, *Haue confidence*: as if it were the same that *Conceiue hope of pardon* is. Then he maketh a weake consequence. If the Lord said first, *Haue confidence*: and after, *Thy sinnes are forgiuen thee*. Therfore that confidence of which he spake, went before forgiuenes of sinnes. Lastly he followeth the false interpretation of the word [*apheōntai*] *forgiuen*, which signifieth not *are forgiuen*, but, *haue bene forgiuen*, for it is not of the time present, but past. And

the

the naturall sense of the words is this: Haue confidence sonne, that thou shalt obtaine of me healing of thy palsie: because thou hast already obtained a farre greater benefit, to wit, forgiuenesse of sinnes. But if that were the sense which *Bellarmine* giueth the words should sound thus, *Haue confidence sonne, and thy sinnes shalbe forgiuen thee:* that is (as *Bellarmine* would haue it) Conceiue hope of pardon, or forgiuenesse of sinnes; for if thou so do, it shall be done vnto thee.

Bellarmines *arguments, that loue disposeth vnto forgiuenesse of sinnes,*

The fourth disposition (saith *Bellarmine* further) is loue. Now that some loue is before forgiuenesse of sinnes, either in time, if it be imperfect loue, or in nature, if it be perfect and from the whole heart, *Ecclesiasticus* teacheth first (saith he) chapt. 2. For after that he had sayd, *Yee that feare the Lord, trust in him,* hee addeth, *Yee that feare the Lord, loue him, and your harts shall be inlightned.* Then also our Sauiour himselfe teacheth it, when hee saith, *Luk.* 7. *Many sinnes are forgiuen her, because shee loued much.* Also the Apostle *Paule* teacheth it, when he writeth, *Galath.* 5. *Neither Circumcision auaileth any thing, nor Vncircumcision: but faith which worketh by loue.*

» The Apostle *Iohn* teacheth the same, » 1. *Iohn.* 3. saying, *We are translated from* » *death to life, because we loue the brethren.*

I answere. As touching that place in *Ecclesiasticus*: it is not of force to proue any point of faith, because the booke is Apocryphal. Then, that sentence is not found in the Greeke copie. Thirdly, he treateth not there of remission of sinnes, wherefore this sentence is nothing to the purpose. As concerning the other places, *Luc.* 7. the coniunction *because*, in Greeke [*hóti*,] noteth not the cause of the *thing*, but the cause of the *conclusion*: that is the argument, whereby the sentence proposed is proued. And that argument was drawen not from the cause, but from the effect. For, that many sinnes are forgiuen this woman, Christ proueth by her deede, as an effect of the forgiuenesse of sinnes, which she perceiued she had obteyned by the grace of Christ. As is plaine by the Simile, which the Lord addeth to declare that deede, to wit, the creditor, which forgaue two debtors, to the one, more; to the other, lesse: whereupon it came, that the one loued him more, the other lesse. As therefore that loue of the debtors, was not the cause

of

of forgiuing the det: but contrarywise, the forgiuing of the det, was cause of their loue: so also the loue of that woman, was not the cause why Christ forgaue her her sinnes: but contrariwise, the forgiuenesse of sinnes, was cause why the woman loued him. Neither is this declaration answered, by the exposition which *Bellarmine* bringeth in an other place, that the coniunction [*hóti*] *because*, is a causal. For it is not named a causal, for that it signifieth the cause of the thing, but for that it signifieth the cause of the conclusion: that is, the argument or *medium* of the proofe.

From the words *Gal.* 5. it cannot be gathered, that loue disposeth vnto iustification: but onely we are taught, what maner of faith that is whereby we are iustified, namely faith working by loue.

In the place out of the Epistle of *Iohn*, *Bellarmine* hath committed the crime of falshood, for that he hath cited the text vnperfectly, that he might wrest it vnto his purpose. For it is not there, *We are translated, &c.* but, *We know that we are translated.* It is euident therefore, that loue is not there made the cause of our translation from death to life: but the

signe and argument, whereby we know that we are translated. And loue is the signe of this thing: because it is the effect of true faith, by which that translation is made, as our Lord witnesseth, *Ioh.* 5. 24. *He that beleeueth, hath passed from death into life.*

The second principall argument. *Bellarmine* proceedeth to another principall argument; which he concludeth in this reasoning: If faith be separated from hope and loue and other vertues, without doubt it cannot iustifie: Therefore onely faith cannot iustifie. The consequence of this argument is proued saith he, thus: If the whole force of iustifying were in faith only, so that other vertues though they were present, conferred nothing at all vnto iustification; surely that faith would iustifie * as well when they are present, as absent. Therefore, if it cannot iustifie when they are absent, it argueth that the force of iustifying is not in it onely, but partly in it, partly in the other.

* *It should be, as well when they are absent, as present.*

Also: If it cannot be, that faith seuered from loue should iustifie; then it alone iustifieth not. But the first is true: for without loue there can be no iustice: because he that loueth not, abideth in death,

death, 1. *John* 3. Therefore the latter also is true. Besides, if faith separated from vertues can iustifie, it can also doo the same with vices: for as the presence of other vertues profiteth faith nothing, as concerning the dutie of iustifying, because it onely iustifieth: so the presence of vices shall nothing hinder it as touching the office of iustifying: because by accident, there are ioyned with it either vices or vertues. But the consequent is absurd: therefore also the antecedent.

I answere. All these connexe or (as *Bellarmine* calleth them) conditionate propositions of these three reasons, are false. For although faith be not alone, but hath other vertues ioyned with it, and not vices (which is impossible:) yet faith onely iustifieth. Euen as the hand of a writer, although it be not alone, but ioyned with the other members: yet it onely writeth. And as the foote is not alone, but ioyned to the other members, yet it onely standeth. Likewise as the eye is not alone, and yet alone seeth: the eare is not alone, but yet heareth alone. Finally, the members of

mans body, although they be ioyned one to another, and cannot do their seuerall actions, except they be ioyned one to another, yet haue euery one their proper action.

The third principall argument. The third principall argument, whereby *Bellarmine* would proue that faith iustifieth not alone, is taken (faith he) from the remouing away of the causes which may be giuen why faith onely iustifieth. For all such causes may be reduced (faith he) vnto three heads. And thus he concludeth.

> *If faith alone iustifieth: either it therefore iustifieth alone because the scripture expressly saith it, or because it pleased God to giue iustification with the onely condition of faith: or because it alone hath the force to apprehend iustification, and apply it vnto vs, and make it ours.*
>
> *But none of these causes can truly be said of faith.*
>
> *Therefore neither can it be truly said of it, that it only iustifieth.*

The first part of the assumption he endeauoureth to proue by this, that in the scripture there is found an expresse deny all of that word (to wit, *Only*) or a word of the same signification: namely, *Iam. 2. Tee see*

that

that of workes a man is iustified, and not of faith onely. The second part he proueth by this, that scriptures doo much more openly require the conditiō of repentance and of the Sacraments vnto Iustification, then of faith: as *Ezek.* 18. *If the wicked repent, he shall liue.* Luk. 13. *Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.* Ioh. 3. *Except a man be borne againe of water and of the holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God.* The third part, he endeuoureth to proue thus: for that faith is not said properly to apprehend: or certainly, Iustification is not so apprehended by faith, that it is had indeed and inherent: but onely that it is in the mind after the manner of an obiect, apprehended by the action of the vnderstanding or will: But after this manner loue also and ioy do apprehend.

I answere. The assumption of the syllogisme proposed is false, as touching the third part or branch. For onely faith apprehendeth Christs satisfaction vnto Iustification: because by faith onely we can make full account, that Christ hath satisfied for vs, and by his satisfaction obtained of God forgiuenesse of sinnes for vs. And in this very sence faith onely is

said to iustifie, because it onely apprehendeth Christs satisfaction: for which onely, and not for our works also, god counteth vs for iust. And this answere is inough for soluing the Argument propounded. Yet in the meane time, the Reader is to be put in minde, as touching the first part of the assumption, that it is not denied by *Iames* of true faith, that it onely iustifieth, but this only he meaneth, that man is not iustified by a dead faith, but by a liuing faith, which of it self bringeth forth good workes.

And although it bee not found expressly written, *Faith onely iustifieth*: yet is there found a sentence of equall force, namely, *A man is not iustified but by faith*, Gal. 2. 16.

Besides, as touching the second part of the assumption: it is false, that the scripture requireth the condition of the sacraments vnto Iustification: as though none could be iustified without the sacraments. Neither can it be proued from that place, *Ioh.* 3. *Except a man be borne againe*: for Christ speaketh not there of Baptisme, but of the holy Ghost that regenerateth: which hee compareth to water.

The

The 4. Argument *Bellarmine* fetcheth from the maner of iustifying of faith. And this hee parteth into three. The first is: Faith iustifieth after the manner of a cause: therefore it iustifieth not onely. *The 4. principall Argument which hath three brāches.*

I answere. I deme the consequence: For although faith iustifieth after the maner of a cause; yet it iustifieth alone: for it iustifieth as an instrumentall cause, apprehending Christes satisfaction, for which onely wee are iustified. And there is no other instrumentall cause whereby Christs satisfaction is apprehended. *1. Branch.*

The other Argument. Faith is the beginning formall cause of Iustification: Therefore it iustifieth not onely. To proue the antecedent, these sayings are brought. *Rom 4. To him that beleeueth in him that iustifieth the vngodly, his faith is imputed for iustice. 1. Cor. 3. Other foundation can no man lay, &c.* Where by foundation, *Bellarmine* would haue vnderstood, faith in Christ. And the foundation is the beginning of the house: Therefore also faith is the beginning of Iustification. *Act. 15. By faith purifying their hearts.* *2. Branch.*

And

And what is pureneſſe of heart (ſaith *Bellarmine*) but iuſtice either begun or perfected.

I anſwere. I denie the antecedent: and I denie, that it can be proued by the ſayings alleadged. For *Rom.* 4. Faith is ſaid to be reputed for iuſtice, in this ſence, for that iuſtice is imputed vnto a mã by faith. For ſo the Apoſtle there ſaith, in the words next ioyned to them, that *Dauid* ſaid, *The man is bleſſed to whom God imputeth iuſtice*, namely by faith: as we may perceiue by conferring of the words that go before: as alſo by conference of that phraſe ſo much vſed of *Paul*, wherein he ſaith, *That God iuſtifieth men through faith, of faith, by faith.* Now to iuſtifie and to impute iuſtice, are of equal force with the ſame Apoſtle. Next, *1. Cor.* 3. by the name of *foundation*, is vnderſtood Chriſt, as the Apoſtle himſelf plainly affirmeth; that is to ſay, the doctrine of Chriſt, namely, of his perſon and office. For hee there handleth Chriſtian doctrine, and not iuſtification. *Bellarmine* therefore Sophiſtically wreſteth the name *foundation*, vnto Iuſtification: as though he treated there of the foundation, that is the beginning of Iuſtification.

A Now

Now, Act. 15. *Peter* saith, their hearts were purified by faith, because by faith the hearts are certified, that the bloud of Christ purgeth vs from all sinne: to wit so, as that no sinne is imputed to vs. Therefore pureneſſe of heart is euill restrained of *Bellarmine*, vnto pureneſs or iuſtice inherent: when as there is also pureneſſe or iuſtice imputed.

The third Argument fraieth from the queſtion propounded: for it concludeth a diuerſe thing; namely thus. Faith obtaineth forgiueneſſe of ſinnes, & after it ſo alſo deſerueth it: therefore it iuſtifieth not, becauſe it apprehendeth the promiſe. The antecedent hee proueth from *Luk.* 7. where our Lord ſaith to the woman, *Thy faith hath made thee ſafe.* But if faith did onely receiue mercie, it could not rightly be ſaid to ſaue. For who would ſay to a poore man, that onely reacheth out his hand for almes, thy hand hath got the almes? or who would ſay to a ſick man, that with his hand taketh the medicine, Thy hand hath cured thee of thy diſeaſe?

I anſwere, It followeth not: Faith maketh ſafe, therefore it ſaueth by obtaining and deſeruing. For the word *make* in generall noteth an efficient cauſe.

And

And from the generall to the special, the consequence followeth not affirmatively. And how faith maketh safe, wee must learne out of the scripture: which declareth the nature and force of faith in iustifying, no otherwise then by relation vnto Christs satisfaction, as the obiect which it apprehendeth and applieth to a man, as *Rom.* 3. *By faith in his bloud.* Gal. 2. *Who hath loued me and giuen himself for me, &c.* And although no wise man would say, *Thy hand hath got thy almes*: yet might one rightly say to him that is enriched by receiuing almes: *Thy hand hath made thee rich.* For if he had not taken the almes, he had not been enriched. So our faith hath not made for vs Christes satisfaction: but yet by receiuing it, it enricheth and iustifieth vs. Finally when it is said, *Faith iustifieth*, it is a figuratiue speech; to bee vnderstood thus *God Iustifieth* a beleeuer, because of Christs satisfaction which he apprehendeth by faith.

Bellarmine bringeth also other places of scripture to confirme his antecedent, namely, *Rom* 4. *Abraham was comforted by faith giuing glory to God, &c. Therefore also was it counted vnto him for iustice.* In this place, the Apostle sheweth the cause

cause why *Abrahams* faith was coun- "
ted iustice: because in beleeuing hee "
gaue glory to God. Therefore that "
faith pleased God, by which he was glo- "
rified: and therefore for desert of that "
faith (which notwithstanding was his gift "
and grace) he iustified *Abraham*. Also "
Rom. 10. *Whosoeuer shall call vpon the name* "
of the Lord shall be saued. How shal they cal "
vpon him in whom they haue not beleeued? "
how shall they beleeue without a Preacher? "
Where S. *Paul* (saith *Bellarmine*) as hee "
maketh the preaching of the word, the "
cause of faith: so hee maketh faith the "
cause of inuocation: and inuocation "
the cause of saying: that is, of *Iu-* "
stification. Whereby wee vnderstand
(saith he further) that faith by inuocation,
obtaineth iustification. Faith therefore
iustifieth not relatiuely, to wit, by accep-
ting Iustification offered. Lastly, in the
11. to the *Heb.* the Apostle teacheth by
many examples, that men please God by
faith: & by this, that faith is of great price
and merit with God.

I answere. Although that place *Rom.* 4.
may seeme much to fauor *Bellarmines* o-
pinion: yet if one look throghly into it, &
consider the applying of *Abrahãs* exãple

vnto

vnto vs. Which immediatly followeth, he shall see, the causall coniunction *dio, therefore*, not to be so much referred vnto that effect of *Abrahãs* faith, to wit, glorifying of God, as vnto the truth of his faith: which truth is signified by that effect. For in applying *Abrahams* example, hee doth not now mention strong faith: such as that of *Abrahãs* was: but simply true faith to wit, whereby we beleeue that God gaue Iesus for our sinnes, and raised him vp for our Iustification. The place *Rom.* 10 speaketh not of Iustification, but of saluation: that is, glorification. Which although it be obtained by inuocation proceeding of faith: yet is it not obtained by the merit of faith, but by Gods grace and the way that he hath prescribed. Lastly, although out of *Hebr.* 11. it is manifest that faith is of great price with God: yet hence it followeth not, that wee by faith do merit Gods benefits. For as other the benefits of God, so faith it selfe also is Gods free gift, as the Apostle witnesseth, *Eph.* 2. 8.

The 5. principal argumẽt, which hath 2. branches.

There remaineth the last argument: which *Bellarmine* saith is taken from two principles: of which the one is, that the formal cause of Iustification is Iustice really inherent in vs: the other, that good works are necessarie to saluation. Be-

Before wee see how *Bellarmine* dooth reason frō these principles; it is meet first to put in minde, that that first principle is false, euen by *Bellarmines* owne testimonie: For else-where he saith, The formall cause of Iustification consisteth in the infusion of that inherent iustice. But infusion of iustice, is not the inherent iustice it selfe. But now let vs see how he reasoneth from these principles.

2. *Books of Iustificatiō Chapt.* 2.

Frō the first principle he reasoneth thus:

Vnto the infusion of iustice are more actions required then the action of faith:
But Iustification is the infusion of iustice:
Therfore vnto Iustification are required moe actions then the action of faith: And by consequence, onely faith Iustifieth not, after the manner of disposition.

I answere. First *Bellarmine* here departeth frō the question: not oppugning the opinion of the professors of the Gospell, but a Popish fiction. For the professors of the Gospel, when they say, that faith onely iustifieth, do not meane, that it iustifieth onely by way of disposition, but by way of apprehension: as hath already bin often declared. Then the assumption is false: as we haue shewed before. Besides, *Bellarmine* agreeth not with himself: who

now affirmeth, that the action of faith is fore-required vnto Iustification, also that it disposeth vnto Iustificatiō, whē before he said, that *Faith iustifieth as the beginning and first roote of Iustification*: and afterward he maketh faith part of the formall cause of *Iustification*, where he saith, *That faith is not the whole formal cause of Iustification.* And in an other place, *that the formall cause of Iustification consisteth in faith, hope and charitie*: Is part of the forme therefore, fore-required for the obtaining of the forme?

1 *Booke of Iustificatio Chap.* 13. 2. *Booke Chapt.* 4. *Of grace and free-will.* 1. *Booke. Chap.* 6. *The latter Branch.*

Now frō the other principle, he draweth this argument.

If faith only doe iustifie, it should only saue also.
But it doth not only saue: because good works are also necessarie to saluation.
Therefore it doeth not iustifie.

Answere, Although this argument at the first sight hathe a great shew: yet if it be throghly looked into, it will be found to be a Paralogisme, having foure termes by the *homonymie* or double signification of the argument or middle terme. For that *Only faith* in the proposition, is to be vnderstood specially of saluation, which is by way of apprehension: but in the assumption, it is vnderstood generally of saluation

* 1. *A false argument.*

saluation which is any maner of way. For faith onely saueth as the instrumentall apprehending cause, to wit, by apprehending Christes satisfaction, for which God saueth the beleeuer: but it doth not onely saue euery maner of way: for Gods grace and Christs satisfaction also saueth, but as the principall efficient causes: also good workes saue, but as the way by which God bringeth the beleeuers vnto saluation. This double signification being obserued, I answere to the assumption, where it is said, *Faith saueth not onely*. If this be vnderstood generally, it is true: but then an other thing is assumed then was in the proposition. For whe it is said in the proposition, *Faith onely saueth*: that is not vnderstood generally, but specially: to wit, by way of apprehension. But if the assumption bee vnderstood specially, as in the proposition, namely; that faith onely saueth not by laying hold on Christs satisfaction; it is manifestly false.

CHAP. IIII.

The proofe of the third part, recited, and refuted.

HItherto of the second part of the Papists sentence, wherein they contend, that faith onely iustifieth not. Now followeth the third part, wherein they dispute, that Iustification standeth not onely in forgiuenesse of sins. Which *Bellarmine* purposeth to proue thus. Iustification consisteth also (saith he) in inward renuing. Therefore not in forgiuenesse of sinnes onely. Wee denie the antecedent. But to proue that, *Bellarmine* bringeth some places of scripture: which wee will consider in order.

1 *Books of Iustificatiõ Chap. 6.*

The first place is *Rom. 4. Who was deliuered for our sinnes, and rose againe for our iustification.* That is, as *Bellarmine* interpreteth: that we may walke in newnesse of life.

I answer. This exposition of *Bellarmines* is false, cõfoũding those things which the Apostle distinguisheth. For *Paul* beginneth in that Epistle to dispute of renuing of nature, or of sanctification, at the sixt chapter.

chapter, hauing finished the disputation of iustification in the fift chapter. And the sense of the place alleaged is: That Christ was deliuered vnto death for our sinnes, that is, to purge our sinnes by satisfaction, and was raised vp for our iustification: that is to say, that he might make knowen our iustification: to wit, that he hath obtained it by his death for vs. For if he had not risen from the dead, we should yet be in our sinnes: 1. *Cor.* 15. Wherefore seeing he is risen againe, we know that we are no more in our sinnes, but that forgiuenesse of sinnes, or our iustification is gotten for vs by Christs death.

The second place is, *Rom.* 5. *As sinne reigned vnto death, so also grace reigneth by iustice vnto eternall life.* Frō hence *Bellarmine* reasoneth thus. He opposeth iustice to sin: and by iustice vnderstandeth renuing, from which works proceed of life, for that the opposition requireth. For sinne is said to haue reigned vnto death, because it wrought deadly workes: contrariwise, therfore the grace of God is said to reign by iustice vnto life, because by iustice infused, it worketh the works of life. And if inward renuing, which is the beginning of good works, be rightly called iustice, The 2. place.

out of doubt Iustification must be constituted in that renuing, and not in forgiuenesse of sinnes onely.

I answere. Againe *Bellarmine* bringeth a false exposition. For the Apostle entreateth nothing in that Chapter, of renuing of nature: but afterward in the Chapter following. And the meaning of the place alleaged, by comparing it vnto the former, with which it agreeth, may be perceiued to be this. As *Adams* sinne reigned in his posterite vnto death, because being imputed vnto thē, it brought death: that so the grace of God whereby he imputeth iustice to them that beleeue, for Christs satisfaction, reigneth in them vnto life eternall: because iustice being imputed to them, bringeth life eternall.

The third place is, *Rom. 6. Neither exhibit your members as weapons of iniquitie to sinne: but exhibite your selues to God, as liuing from the dead, and your members weapons of iustice to God.*

I answere. This place speaketh not of *Iustification*: the dispute whereof the Apostle ended in the 5. Chapter: but entreateth of sanctification. Wherefore it maketh nothing to the matter.

The 4. place is, *Rom. 8. The spirit be-*

neth for Iustification: or (as it is in the Greek) "
the spirit of life for iustice: Bellarmine ad- "
deth: Iustification or iustice, which ma- "
keth to liue, and by this to worke, cannot "
be forgiuenesse of sinnes onely: but some "
inward and inherent thing. "

I answere. Againe he bringeth a false exposition: for neither speaketh he here of Iustification, but of sanctification: as is manifest by the things before and after. And the meaning of the place is: that the spirit of God, dwelling in them that beleeue and are iustified by faith, quickneth them, as concerning study of iustice or good workes: so that now they cease to giue themselues to sinne, and contrariwise doo studie for iustice and good workes.

The 5. place is *Gal.* 3. *If there had beene* "
a Law giuen, that could haue giuen life: surely iustice had beene by the law. Here the A- "
postle sheweth openly (saith *Bellarmine*) "
that *Iustice* whereupon *Iustification* is cal- "
led, is something that giueth life to the "
soule: and constituteth it in motion and "
action.

But I see not by what syllogisme *Bellarmine* gathereth this cõsequence from the Apostles words. The meaning of the

Apostle is: If the law could giue life to man, vnto whom it was giuen: that is, could giue him strength perfectly to fulfill or keep it: then should man's iustice arise of the law: that is, man should be iust, and counted of God for iust for the law by him obserued. But by what force wil you conclude frō hence, that iustification consisteth in that iustice which constituteth the soule in action, that is, in inherent iustice? Yea the contrary may rather be frō hence concluded: namely, that iustification consisteth not in that iustice: for that iustice, which is required vnto iustification, namely, perfect obseruation of the law, falleth not vnto man in this life.

6. Place. The sixt place is, *Ephes.4. Be renued in the spirit of your minde, and put on the new man, which according to God is created in iustice and holinesse of truth.* Where the Apostle calleth renuing, iustice and holinesse.

I answere. This place also maketh nothing to the matter: seeing it speaketh not of iustification, but of sanctification: neither of the iustice of faith, but of the iustice of workes: which although it be not perfect, and euery way absolute

lute in the regenerate, so as to answer in euery part to the law of God: yet is it true and sincere, and not feigned.

To these arguments *Bellarmine* addeth three reasons, which he calleth naturall: which also we will consider. *Three reasons.*

The first reason is, Iustification without doubt is a certaine motion from sinne vnto iustice: and hath it name from the thing whereunto it leadeth, as all other the like motiõs, inlightning, warning, &c. True iustification therefore cannot be vnderstood, except some iustice be gotte besides forgiuenesse of sinnes: euen as it can neither be true inlightning, nor true warning: if when darknesse is driuen away, or cold expelled, there follow no light, and no heate in the subiect the body. 1.

I answere. Iustification, it is in deed a kind of motion from sinne to iustice, but not such as *Bellarmine* feigneth: to wit, such as inlightning and warning be. For it is not the motion of expelling sinne and infusing iustice: for this motion in scripture is not called Iustification, but *Regeneratiõ, Renouation, Sanctification.* But it is the motion of forgiuing or remitting sinne, and imputing iustice. Now forgiue-

neſſe of ſinne, and imputing of iuſtice, differ onely in name, indeed they are the ſame: as appeareth by the Apoſtles words *Rom.* 4. 6. 7. as we haue declared elſwhere. And what other thing is it to driue out darkneſſe, but to bring in light? alſo what els, to expell cold, but to put in warmth? Vnaptly therfore doth *Bellarmine* feigne, that darkeneſſe may be driuen away, and cold expelled, although there follow no light nor heate in the ſubiect body.

2. The ſecond reaſon. Iuſtification (ſaith *Bellarmine*) is not therefore onely giuen vs of God, that we may eſcape the paines of hell, but alſo that we may get the rewards of heauenly life. But ſurely, onely forgiueneſſe of ſinnes deliuereth from paine, doth not giue glorie. Which thing we ſee daily in ciuil iudgements. For they that are quitted by the iudge, are deliuered from death, but they get not new rewards for this alone, that they are iudged not to haue bene, or not to be guiltie.

I deny the aſſumption. For remiſſion of ſinnes doth not onely deliuer from paine, to wit, eternall death, but alſo bringeth glorie or eternall life. The reaſon of which thing is this, that remiſſion of

ſinnes,

sinnes, wherein mans iustification consisteth, is remission of all sinnes: and therefore not onely of sinnes of committing, but also of sinnes of omitting: whereby it commeth, that he to whome God forgiueth sinnes, is so accounted of, as if he had not only committed nothing which God hath forbidden in his law: but also, omitted nothing of that which he hath commanded: and therefore, as if he had perfectly fulfilled the law of God. Now where the perfect fulfilling of the law is, there also is life; according to that, *The man that doeth these thinges shall liue in them*. Moreouer, the example of ciuil iudgement which *Bellarmine* bringeth, proueth not his assumption: because that absolution is vnlike to the absolution of God. For this is vniuersall, to wit from all sinnes against the law of God: but that is particular or special, to wit, fro some certaine crime or crimes, against the politick lawes. Notwithstanding, the ciuil iudge giueth vnto him whome he hath quitted from certaine crimes, those rewards which hee hath promised to the innocent, namely, preseruation in life and defence; although hee giue him no new and singular rewards which hee hath

promised onely to certaine vertuous exploits. And so God giueth eternall life as a reward to those, vnto whome he hath promised it, to wit, vnto those that keepe his law: such as he accounteth all those, whose sinnes he hath forgiuen.

„ The third reason. *Iustification of enemies*
„ *maketh friends, children, beloued, citizens*
„ *with Saints, of the household of God, heyres of*
„ *his kingdome.*

„ *Onely forgiuenesse of sinnes, maketh not*
„ *men such.*

„ *Therefore onely forgiuenesse of sinnes is*
„ *not iustification.*

„ The assumption he would proue thus:
„ For one is not worthy of loue for this
„ only that his dets are forgiuen him when
„ hee cannot pay them. Neither is hee
„ straight-way made a sonne, a citizen, or of
„ the household, or an heyre: who by the
„ iudges clemencie vndergoeth not the
„ punishment, whereto he was iustly ad-
„ iudged.

I deny the assumption. And I proue the contrary by the Apostles words, *Eph.* 1. 5. 6. 7. *He hath predestinate vs to be adopted through Iesu Christ, vnto himselfe, according to the good pleasure of his will: To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherewith he*

hath

hath made vs accepted in that Beloued, by whome wee haue redemption through his bloud, the forgiuenesse of sinnes. If thou askest how God hath adopted vs for sonnes, and so for heyres of his kingdome? also, how he hath made vs accepted, that is, friends and beloued? the Apostle answereth: *By Iesus Christ*: also, *In that* (his) *beloued*: and declaring this same thing, he saith, *that in him or by him, we haue redemption through his bloud, the forgiuenes of sinnes.* Therefore the Apostle sheweth no other thing *by which* we are made the friends of God, then the forgiuenesse of sinnes: neither any other thing *for which*, then the redemption made by the bloud of Christ.

The proofe which *Bellarmine* bringeth of the assumption, hath no force, for the manners of dealing with God and with men is vnlike. Men are not so affected that they will straightway vouchsafe to heape benefits on him, to whom they haue forgiuen offences: but God, to whomsoeuer he forgiueth offences for Christ, them he prosecuteth with eternal fauour for his sake; and thereupon heapeth his benefits on them, though vnworthy.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The proofe of the fourth part, recited and refuted.

NOw remayneth the fourth and last part of the Papists sentence, That iustification consisteth not in imputation of Christes iustice.

1. *Proofe.* This first he would proue by this, that it is neuer read in the scripture, that Christes iustice is imputed to vs: or, that we are iust, by Christes iustice imputed to vs.

Before I answere this argument, I will first shew in what sense these things be spoken of the professors of the Gospell, whome *Bellarmine* oppugneth. Therefore when they say, That Christes iustice is imputed to vs, they vnderstand, the iustice gotten by Christes death. Therefore this they meane: That iustice is imputed to vs of God, or, we are counted of God iust, for the death of Christ, whereby hee hath satisfied his iudgement for our sinnes. Which is all one as if they should say, that Christes satisfaction is of God imputed vnto vs for iustice.

Iustice. This appeareth by *Calvins* words in his third booke of Instit. chap. 11. §. 3. Which place *Bellarmine* himselfe citeth: namely, *To iustifie, is nothing else, but to acquite from guiltinesse, as being of approued innocency, him that is guiltie or so accused. When as therefore God iustifieth vs by Christes intercession, he doth not acquite vs, by approuing of our owne innocencie, but by imputation of iustice: that we are counted iust in Christ, which are not so in our selues.* Behold he saith, *God iustifieth vs by Christes intercession, that is, for Christes intercession*: vnder which name is comprehended satisfaction. Also, *He acquitteth vs by imputation of iustice*, or, in as much as hee imputeth iustice vnto vs: namely for that intercession and satisfaction of Christ. Whereby wee perceiue, that *Calvine* maketh the formall cause of iustification, to be imputation of iustice, which otherwhere he calleth forgiuenesse of sinnes. 2. *Booke of Iustific. chapt.* 1.

Now the meaning of the words being declared, I answere to *Bellarmines* argument: and say, that it is not necessarie that those very wordes, *Christes iustice is imputed to vs*, be read in the scripture: but that it is ynough, if those things

be

be read, from which this sentence may by good consequence be drawen. And such we read: namely where it is said, that *faith is imputed to man for iustice*, and, *that iustice is imputed to man*, Rom. 4. 5. 6. Now seeing these phrases be diuerse, and therfore cannot be both of them proper: we must consider which is proper, and which figuratiue. To speake properly, a thing is said to be imputed to one, which himselfe hath not done, or which is not in himselfe: and contrariwise, that is said not to be imputed, which one hath done, or which is in him. Therefore when iustice is said to be imputed to sinfull man, it is a proper speech: as also when it is said, that sinne is not imputed to a sinner. It is therfore improperly said, that *To him* that beleeueth, faith is imputed for iustice; and therefore this is to be vnfolden by a proper speech: to wit, that *To him* that beleeueth, iustice is imputed: or, he that beleeueth is counted for iust, by faith: as elsewhere the Apostle saith, *The beleeuer is iustified by faith*. Which that it may more fully be vnderstood, it is needfull that the nature of faith be declared by his obiect whereon it leaneth, or which it apprehendeth for iustice. For that is the thing

thing for which the beleeuer is iustified, or iustice is imputed to him: or finally which is imputed to him for iustice by faith. And that obiect of faith is Christes satisfaction: as appeareth by the Apostles words, *Rom.* 3. 25. *Whom God hath set forth a reconciliation by faith in his blood.* Therefore to speake properly, iustice is imputed to vs for Christes satisfaction by faith: because we apprehend that by faith: or Christes satisfaction is imputed to vs for iustice by faith: that is, in as much as it is apprehended by faith.

Secondly, he would proue the same thing by this, that no necessitie can be alleadged of that sort of imputation. 2. *Proofe.*

But, say I, there is manifest necessitie: namely our sinnes which cannot be vndone: but least we be damned for them, it is necessary that they be not imputed to vs, but couered: which is no other thing, then to haue iustice imputed to vs: as appeareth by the Apostles wordes, *Rom.* 4. 6. 7. *Dauid* saith, that *Blessed is that man to whom God imputeth iustice. Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiuen, and whose sinnes are couered: blessed is the man to whom the Lord shall not impute sinne.*

But *Bellarmine* laboureth to confirme his argument, thus.

" *If this imputation were necessarie: it*
" *should therefore chiefly be necessary, for that*
" *man after forgiuenesse of sinne is yet verily*
" *a sinner, to wit, his sinne being couered, not*
" *taken away.*
" *But this cause of necessitie hath no place.*
" *Because by forgiuenesse of sinnes, sinne is ve-*
" *rily taken away, that it is not: (for proofe*
" *whereof, he heapeth together many testimo-*
" *nies of scripture.)*

Therefore this imputation is not necessary.

I answere. First, the proposition is false: for although imputation of iustice be necessary for man, yet is it not therefore necessary, for that man after forgiuenesse of sinne is yet verily a sinner: as though imputation of iustice were done after forgiuenesse of sinnes. For remission of sinnes, and imputation of iustice, are one and the same thing: as appeareth by the Apostles words, *Rom.* 4. 5. 6. where these two are taken as equiualent, for *Iustice to be imputed to man*, and *iniquities to be forgiuen a man*. Yet is it true, that imputation of iustice is necessary for a man, because he is a sinner. Then, *Bellarmine* confirmeth his assumption by a false sentence: to wit, that by forgiuenesse of sins, sinne is vterly taken away, that it is not. For sinne is taken away by forgiuenesse,

not

not so as that it is not, but that it is not imputed, but couered: as *Dauid* expressly teacheth in that place which the Apostle citeth, *Rom.* 4. 7. 8. in these words, *Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiuen, and whose sinnes are couered: blessed is the man to whom the Lord shal not impute sin.* Behold, if thou askest what it is to haue iniquities or sins forgiuen? *Dauid* answereth: It is to haue sins *couered*, that they come not into the sight of God, as iudge. Also, it is to haue sinne *not imputed* of the Lord: to wit, that man be punished for his sinne, as he hath deserued. Wherefore we may not thinke, that in those places of scripture (those I meane that speake of iustificatiō) which *Bellarmine* hath heaped together, a diuerse thing is taught; seeing it is certaine, that the holy Ghost contradicteth not himselfe. Further, vnto that argument, from the opposition of *Adam* vnto Christ, *Rom.* 5. which *Bellarmine* thinketh, the second will admit no answere at all; we haue answered * before. *Bellarmines* third argument is this.

* *Before in the second chapter of this booke, in the solution of the first Argument.*

If faith, hope and loue, can be perfect in this life: the imputation of Christes iustice is not necessary.

But the antecedent is true: Therefore also the consequent. 3. *Proofe.*

I answere. The proposition is false. For first, that imputation of iustice be not necessary for man; it is not ynough, that faith, hope and loue, *can be* perfect in this life, but it behoueth that *they be* perfect. Then, though it be graunted that perfect faith, hope and loue, befall some (as the Martyrs) in this life: yet neuertheleſſe is imputation of iuſtice neceſſary for them, for ſinnes committed before the perfection of thoſe vertues. For we cannot ſatisfie God for them, by the duties of vertues that follow; ſeeing they are owing vnto God. Therefore for old debts another ſatisfaction is needfull. And God cannot be ſatisfied for ſinnes, but by ſuffering the punishment of them. And this hath Chriſt ſuffered for them that beleeue, & ſo hath ſatisfied for their ſinnes: which ſatisfaction is imputed to them for iuſtice: and this imputation is needfull for them: ſeeing they cannot but by it be counted for iuſt, and worthy of eternall life: yea, iuſtifying faith, whether perfect or vnperfect, doth in any wiſe require imputation of iuſtice: ſeeing it iuſtifieth no otherwiſe, then in as much as it apprehendeth Chriſts ſatisfaction, which by the grace of God is imputed for iuſtice to him that beleeueth.

In exposition of the fourth argument, "
Bellarmine alloweth of the Gospellers "
sentence, at least in part: in that he saith, "
it is right if it be so vnderstood: that "
Christs iustice is imputed to vs, that is, "
Christes merits, because they are giuen "
vnto vs: and we can offer them to God "
the Father for our sinnes: because Christ "
hath taken vpon him the burden of sa- "
tisfying for vs, and reconciling vs to God "
the Father. Yet he denyeth, that Chri- "
stes iustice is so imputed vnto vs, that we "
are called, and be formally iust by it, and "
that he would proue thus: "

When there be two contrary formes in "
any, the one inherent, the other outward: "
without doubt the absolute denomination is "
taken from the inherent forme, rather then "
from the outward. For if one should put "
a white garment vpon a black-moore, he "
could not rightly say, This black-moore "
is white: but contrarywise it might right- "
ly be said, this Moore is black; because "
the proper and inherent blacknesse per- "
teyneth more vnto him, then that out- "
ward whitenesse fetched from an other "
thing. "

But in man by the doctrine of imputa- "
tion of iustice there are made two contrary "
formes, the one inherent, namely Iniustice: "

the other outward, namely, imputed iustice. Wherewith men by apprehension is cloathed as with a garment.

Therfore a man to whom iustice is imputed, is rather to be named vniust of the inherent forme, then iust of the outward.

I answer vnto the proposition. Although that denomination be vsuall with men, yet God in this affaire foloweth a diuerse reason in his word: saying both, to wit, that faith is imputed vnto vs for iustice, or that iustice is imputed to vs, to wit by faith, *Rom.* 4. 5. 6. and that we are iustified by faith, *Rom.* 5. 1. And surely, when as we are so far forth iust before God, as iustice is imputed to vs as *Paul* in the place alleaged, *Rom.* 4. doth teach: it is rightly said, that we by imputed iustice, be and are named formally iust.

Now to the assumption. In man to whom iustice is imputed, it is graunted there is vniustice inherent; but it is vnderstood, vniustice cleaving vnto him by sinnes already committed, and not a purpose of doing vniustly. For to whom faith is giuen, that by it iustice is imputed to him, and committed sinnes are forgiuen; to him withall, is giuen a purpose to liue iustly, and to auoyd sinnes.

The

The 5. Argument. If Christs iustice were truly imputed vnto vs, that by it we were counted and thought iust, euen as if it were our owne inward and formall iustice: surely we ought to be counted and thought no lesse iust then Christ himselfe. Then ought wee to be called and counted redeemers and sauiours of the world, and to receiue other such names and attributes of the like sort: which is most absurd. 5. Proof.

I answere. I denie the consequence. For by Christs iustice which is imputed to vs, is vnderstood the obedience of death, wherby he satisfied for our sinnes, and so brought vs euerlasting iustice (as *Daniel* speaketh.) This obedience I say, is imputed to vs for iustice: so that we are esteemed of God, as if our selues had performed it. Neither dooth it follow from hence, that wee should be called and counted redeemers and sauiours of the world: both for that Christs suffering is so imputed to euery beleeuer, as if hee had suffered for himselfe, and not for others: as also because that any may be called the redeemer and sauiour of the world, it is not inough that he be ready to suffer for the world, but it is necessary

sary that he be meete to satisfie God by his suffering for the world: and vnto this is required, that he be not onely man, but a holy man, and besides that, God.

6. *Proofe.* The first Argument. Christ hath restored vs that which we lost in *Adam*. But in *Adam* we lost not imputed iustice: neither to be in Gods image and likenesse by imputation: but true inherent iustice, by which we were truly like vnto God. Therefore we receiue by Christ true iustice and likenesse of God, and not onely an outward imputation. Thus saith *Bellarmine*. Which things that they may the more easily be iudged of, we will resolue them. And they be two syllogismes. The first is this.

That which we lost in Adam, *is restored vs by Christ:*

In Adam *we lost not imputed iustice,*

Therefore imputed iustice is not restored vs by Christ.

The second syllogisme is this.

That which we lost in Adam, *is restored vs by Christ.*

But not but iustice we lost in Adam.

Therefore, inherent iustice is restored vs by Christ.

I answere to the last first. I grant all the latter syllogisme: but the conclusion of it, is far from the question proponed. For although Christ hath restored vs inherent iustice, in regenerating and renuing vs to the Image of God by the holy Ghost, in this life as beginning in the next, perfectly: yet that letteth not, why he should not impute iustice to vs, whereby we may stād in the iudgement of God. As touching the first syllogisme, it first of al is faultie in the forme, because it hath a negatiue minor in the first figure. Then, the conclusion is frō the question proponed. For it is not asked, whether that iustice be restored vs which was imputed to vs in *Adam* before he fel: but it is demanded, whether iustice be imputed to vs, that is, whether wee be esteemed of God for iust, because of Christs satisfaction. Thirdly, the minor *termine* in the assumption is doubtfull. For imputed iustice there may bee vnderstoode either of the iustice which may bee saide to bee imputed to vs in *Adam* before his fall: or of the iustice which wee say now is imputed to vs for Christs satisfaction. In the first sence, the assumption is true: but then there be foure *termini*, for that *minor terminus* in the conclusion is manifestly vnderstood

of the iustice which is said to be imputed to vs in *Adam* before his fall (as is plaine by the word *Restore*. And in the latter sense the assumption is false: for wee lost surely in *Adam* that iustice which now is imputed vnto vs for Christs satisfaction. For by the disobedience of *Adam* we were made vniust, and again, by Christs obedience we are made iust, *Rom.* 5. 19. & that by imputation of iustice, *Rom.* 4. 6.

7. *Proof.* „ The 7. Argument. If by Christs iustice
„ imputed to vs, wee may truly be called
„ iust, & sons of God: then might Christ al-
„ so by our iniustice imputed to him, be tru-
„ ly called a sinner, & (that which the soule
„ trembleth to think) the sonne of the diuel.
„ For the aduersaries graunt that sin was so
„ imputed to Christ, as iustice is imputed to
„ vs. But the consequence is not true, but
„ blasphemous, sacrilegious, and repugnant
„ to all the scripture, wherein Christ is eue-
„ ry where preached to be holy, innocent,
„ immortall, vnpolluted, and most iust.
„ Therefore neither is the antecedent true.

I answere. There be foure *termini*, for the double fulnes of the word *truly*, which in the proposition is vnderstood of the truth of imputation, but in the assumption of the truth of inherence. For after the manner of inherence, Christ was not truly

ly a sinner, but truly holy, innocent, &c. Yet after the manner of imputation he was truly a sinner: for our sins were truly imputed vnto him of God, when as for them he was truly made a curse or execration, *Gal.* 3. 13. that is, accursed: as is there declared, when it is added: For it is written, *Cursed is euery one that hangeth on tree.* Now none is accursed vnto God, but for sin, that is, in as much as either he is a sinner, or so reputed. And so also may be expounded, and it seemeth should bee expounded that place, 2. *Cor.* 5 *Him which knew no sin, he made sin for vs: that we might be made the iustice of God in him.* For although it be a sound exposition, that God made Christ a sacrifice for sin; yet the opposition seemeth to require that it be expounded, *he made him a sinner*; namely by imputing our sins vnto him: for so are we made iust in him, whiles we are made iust by imputation of his suffering.

But *Bellarmine* vrgeth this argument: & from that comparison of the imputation of Christs iustice, and the imputation of our vniustice, he proceedeth to reason thus.

If we were truly vncleane and wicked, euen after iustification: although Christes iustice were imputed vnto vs, yet were we not to be called iust, but vnrighteous.

But

» *But the scripture calleth vs iust and holy,*
» *Gods sonnes and heires after the laver of rege-*
» *neration and renouation.*
» *We are not therefore iustified by imputation*
» *of iustice, but by iustice inherent and abiding*
» *vs.*

The proposition he confirmeth by the comparison before spoken of.

I answere. First, there be 4. *termini* for it is one thing to be called iust after Iustification, as it is set downe in the proposition: and an other thing, *to be called iust after the laver of regeneration and renouation*, as is set downe in the assumption. Then the conclusion followeth not of the premisses, no not though the same argument be repeated in the assumption, which is contained in the proposition, as namely, if it be said, *But the scripture calleth vs iust after Iustification.* But this conclusion followeth of those premisses: *Therfore after Iustification we are not truly vncleane and wicked.* Which no professor of the Gospell denieth. For after the iustification of faith, we are truly cleane and godly by imputation, yea and moreouer also, by inherence of godlinesse, but begun onely: for iustifying faith, doth necessarily bring with it study of godlinesse.

2. *Proofe.* The 8. Argument. Christ in the song
» of Songs, is compared to a Bridegroome:

and

and the Church or iustified soule, is compa-
red to a Bride. And that Bride is said to bee
faire, with the bewtie inherent to her selfe,
not with the bewtie of the Bridegroome
imputed to her. For therfore vnto the Bride
is giuen the bewtie proper to women; and
vnto the Bridegroome, the bewtie proper
to men: that we may vnderstand, that the
bewtie of Christ is one, the bewtie of the
Church or iustified soule is an other. More-
ouer it would be most absurd, if an heauen-
ly Bridegroome, and one that is most faire
indeed, should haue a filthy Bride, and on-
ly decked outwardly with some precious
garment of a man.

I answere. Christes Bride, the Church, in
the Song of Songs, confesseth that shee is
black, & withall affirmeth that she is come-
ly, Chap. 1. 5. By that confession shee ac-
knowledgeth her filthinesse or natiue defor-
mitie, that is, sin: but by that affirmatiō, she
setteth forth the bewtie receiued from the
Bridegroome. And that bewtie is double;
the one of iustice imputed, the other of iu-
stice infused: but this is imperfect in this life.
Wherefore *Bellarmine* doth falsly lay it to
the Gospellers charge, as if they thought,
that Christs Bride euen iustified, should yet
be filthy: or faire onely by imputation of
iustice. Moreouer, although Christes Bride,

be faire, euen by iustice inherent to her: yet hence it followeth not, that she is not iustified by iustice imputed.

9. Proof. The 9. Argument. If by Iustification the heart be prepared vnto the sight of God: then is true cleanneſſe conferred by it, and not imputatiue. But the antecedent is true: therefore also the conſequent. The conſequence of the propoſition is proued by a ſimile. For as the eye being indeed vncleane, though it be counted moſt cleane and pure, cannot ſee the ſunne: ſo neither can an vncleane heart, though it be counted cleane, euer ſee God.

I anſwere. *Bellarmine* doth ſophiſtically oppoſe, true & imputed cleanneſs: as though the cleanneſſe which is imputed vnto vs by faith, were not true cleanneſſe. Alſo by the reſt of his diſputation it appeareth, that hee, by true cleanneſſe, vnderſtandeth inherent cleanneſſe. But the conſequence of his propoſition is falſe. For although it be needfull to haue an eye truly and habitually cleane for to ſee withall: and by Iuſtification the heart is after a ſort prepared to ſee God: yet is not inherent cleanneſſe conferred by it, but by regeneration. Euen as by taking away the purrified matter, a wound is prepared vnto the ſcarre: yet is there no force conferred by it for the would to cloſe together, but

by

by the plaister which is laid vpō the wound being purged of the putrified matter. For God first by Iustification remoueth from man the filth and vncleannesse of sin: then by regeneration endueth him with faith & studie of godlinesse: that by faith hee may be made more sure of his Iustification, and may begin to see God: & by studie of godlinesse cleaue vnto him, vntil he come to see him fully in the other life.

10. The 10. Argument. Christ suffered, that he might sanctifie his people by his blood: *Heb.* 13. that he might sanctifie his Church, *Eph.* 5. that he might cleanse for himselfe a people acceptable. *Tit.* 2. And the Lord himselfe saith, *Ioh.* 17. I sanctifie my selfe for them, that they also may be sanctified in the truth. But if Christ haue sanctified his people not truly, but onely by imputation, hee hath suffered and died in vaine, & he could not performe that he desired. For to be willing to sanctifie, & to sanctifie in the truth, doth not signifie onely to be willing to deliuer from the punishment of sinne, or to be willing that we should be counted for Saints, though indeed we be not so: but to be willing to effect this, whereby we may be truly Saints, cleane and immaculate. Thus farre *Bellarmine*.

10. *Proof.*

The Syllogisme is to be formed thus.

If

If Christ have not sanctified his people truly, but onely imputatiuely: he suffered in vaine.

But he suffered not in vaine. Therefore,

He hath sanctified his people truly, and not onely imputatiuely.

I answere. Againe, *truly* and *imputatiuely* are so philisically opposed. Then, the conclusion is from the question. For the Gospellers confesse, that Christ hath sanctified his people, not onely imputatiuely, but also habitually: or, not onely by imputation of holinesse, but also by reall beginning of holinesse: for by his suffering, he obtained both benefites of God. But yet is followeth not from hence, that the iustification wherewith man is iustified before God, consisteth not in imputation of iustice.

The conclusion. These things the Lord hath given me at this time to dispute against *Bellarmine* sophismes of Iustification. Hee grante that they may be a helpe vnto many to rid themselues out of those sophismes.

FINIS.

Digitized by Google